

Christian Education

Vol. VI

APRIL, 1923

No. 7

OCTOBER, 1922-JULY, 1923

Published Monthly, Omitting August and September, by
THE COUNCIL OF CHURCH BOARDS OF EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA

Robert L. Kelly, *Editor*
111 Fifth Avenue
New York, N. Y.

O. D. Foster, *Associate Editor*

Contributing Editors

George W. Richards, *The Conference on Theological Seminaries*
Charles Foster Kent, *The Association of Biblical Instructors in American
Colleges and Secondary Schools*

Entered as second-class matter October 24, 1921, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 18, 1918.

The subscription price is 50 cents per annum; ten or more subscriptions 40 cents each, 10 cents must be added if payment is made by check. Single copies 10 cents each.

ORDER OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
MINUTES OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BIBLICAL INSTRUCTORS, 1922	347
<i>Ralph K. Hickock</i>	
THE CURRICULUM OF A STATE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF RELIGION	349
<i>Charles Foster Kent</i>	
THE RELATION OF BIBLICAL DEPARTMENTS TO THE CURRICULA OF LIBERAL COLLEGES	355
<i>Robert L. Kelly</i>	
THE CONTENT OF A PRE-THEOLOGICAL COURSE	357
<i>Henry J. Cadbury</i>	
A COURSE OF STUDY IN THE HISTORY OF RELIGIONS	361
<i>Robert E. Hume</i>	
FUNDAMENTALISM—ITS RISE AND PROGRESS	374
<i>William H. Wood</i>	
WHAT TO DO WITH ENTHUSIASM FOR BIBLICAL APOCALYPTICS	384
<i>William C. Whitford</i>	
THE TEACHING OF JESUS CONCERNING SOCIAL PLEASURE AS RECORDED IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS	392
<i>Laura H. Wild</i>	
THE BIBLICAL MATERIAL ON THE ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF TO-DAY	399
<i>Ralph K. Hickock</i>	
THE BIBLICAL MATERIAL ON POLITICAL PROBLEMS	406
<i>Irwin R. Beiler</i>	

Christian Education

Vol. VI

APRIL, 1923

No. 7

THE 1922 CONFERENCE OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BIBLICAL INSTRUCTORS *

The annual conference of the Association met at New Haven, December 29 and 30, in conjunction with five other societies. About fifty members were present and each of the sessions was crowded. An earnest, constructive spirit characterized all the discussions. Every one present left the conference with a new vision of the magnitude and importance of his task and with a deeper sense of consecration to the work that lies ahead.

At dinner Friday evening, the special committee on College Entrance Board examination in Biblical History reported that the Board would not prepare such an examination until the request came from a sufficient number of preparatory schools and colleges to justify this step. The responsibility, therefore, lies primarily at the doors of the preparatory schools. Over two hundred and fifty colleges have already accepted Biblical History as an elective for admission. Other colleges are ready to follow the lead of the Board. As soon as the Biblical departments in the preparatory schools begin to send up students prepared in this subject, provision for examination will doubtless be made. A preparatory school committee with Dean T. R. Hyde of the Hyde School as Chairman was appointed to arrange, if possible, a conference with the Headmaster's Association to inform the Biblical instructors in the preparatory schools regarding the point at issue.

Professor Peritz of Syracuse University reported for the Committee on Lantern Slides that the best slides on Palestine can be secured either from the Keystone Photo Company, 148 West 52nd Street, New York City, or from the Vester and Co., American Colony and Supply House, Jerusalem, Palestine.

* Editor's note: Professor Charles Foster Kent is responsible for the editorial work on this issue of *Christian Education*.

At the Saturday luncheon it was voted to change the name of the Association to The National Association of Biblical Instructors.

Professor Seal Thompson of Wellesley was appointed chairman of a committee to arrange a conference with the Headmistresses' Association, to study the problems of Biblical and Religious instruction at the girl's preparatory and finishing schools, and to secure closer co-operation between the two associations.

Professor Chapin of Converse College, South Carolina, urged that steps be taken to form a Southern section of the Association. The proposal met with universal approval. A strong desire was expressed for closer co-operation with the strong body of Biblical teachers in the southern schools and colleges. It was the conviction of all that the initiative should come from the South. The President of the Association was instructed to co-operate with any such movement. It was suggested that a conference might be arranged at Blue Ridge in June in connection with the other conferences held there at that time.

Voted: We request the Commission, of which Professor Edward C. Moore is chairman, appointed by the Conference of Theological Seminaries to outline more definitely the courses which should be taken in college if the seminary years are to be as rich as they ought to be. The Secretary was instructed to communicate this vote to Dr. Moore.

Professor I. F. Wood, Chairman of the Nominating Committee, proposed the following officers for the coming year and they were duly elected:

President—Professor Charles Foster Kent of Yale University.

Vice-President—Dean T. R. Hyde of the Hill School.

Recording-Secretary—Professor Ralph K. Hickok of Wells College.

Corresponding Secretary and Treasurer—Professor Elihu Grant of Bryn Mawr College.

Program Committee—Professor W. H. Wood of Dartmouth.

Chairman—Professor Muriel Streibert and Dean Elbert Russel.

A detailed report of the papers and discussion follows.

RALPH K. HICKOCK, Secretary.

THE CURRICULUM OF A STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF RELIGION

PROFESSOR CHARLES FOSTER KENT, YALE UNIVERSITY

To-night at the opening of our Association of Biblical Instructors, I wish to lay before you a problem that involves nearly a quarter of a million students in our great tax-supported universities. It defines in fresh and concrete form one of the major problems that we all share in common. We are able here to study it divested of the hampering traditions which so easily beset us in our eastern colleges. I present it at the beginning of our conference because we desire your inspiration and counsel. The findings of this conference may carry far in molding the educational policy of our great state institutions and of the schools of religion at their doors.

As most of you know, while giving a series of lectures a year ago at the leading state universities of the Middle West, I was asked by a faculty committee of the University of Iowa to prepare a definite plan which would enable them to correlate the religious resources of that university and to provide for their students the equivalent of a department of religion. After discussing the plans in detail with the experienced secretaries of the Church Boards of Education and with the student and local pastors, at several of the state universities, the interest of faculty groups at the University of Michigan and Ohio was enlisted. As the result, committees were appointed at each of these universities to take steps to establish at their doors schools of religion.

Later, at the request of the chairmen of these local committees, I laid the plans before the Council of Church Boards of Education at its annual conference in Chicago, and they received the general endorsement of that body. Also at the invitation of Mr. Frank A. Vanderlip, a group of men, including Dr. Robert L. Kelly, Dr. O. D. Foster and representatives of certain of the denominational Boards of Education met at his home in Scarborough for a two days' conference. This conference recommended that a Council of Schools of Religion be established to devote itself directly to the many problems in this broad and comparatively new field and at the same time to work in close co-operation with

such agencies as the Council of Church Boards of Education already dealing with different phases of the work.

The conference recommended that I ask for another half year's leave of absence to act as Director of the Council and that a budget be prepared to provide for preliminary surveys, conferences and necessary secretarial expenses.

At the request of this conference, Dr. Anson Phelps Stokes assumed the chairmanship of the General Advisory Committee and rendered valuable assistance in organizing the Council and in developing its policy. The following Board of Trustees was appointed and has carried out effectively the recommendations of the Vanderlip conference:

Judge Henry Wade Rogers, chairman, Cleveland E. Dodge, Treasurer, Dr. Harry E. Fosdick, Edwin F. Gay, Judge Alton B. Parker, Professor Jeremiah W. Jenks, George Foster Peabody, Roger H. Williams, Lloyd W. Smith, Samuel Thorne, Jr. and Frank A. Vanderlip.

About seventy-five of the leading educators, such as Ex-President Charles W. Elliot, Dr. John H. Finley, Commissioner Frank P. Graves, Dr. Robert L. Kelly, President W. Douglas Mackenzie, Mr. Edwin S. Martin, the Editor of *Harper's Magazine* and Bishop Francis J. McConnell, are active members of the General Advisory Committee of the Council. Another committee with its center at Chicago under the chairmanship of Mr. Marquis Eaton, a graduate of the University of Michigan, has charge of the educational policy of the Council. It includes in its membership six of the presidents of the leading middle west state universities and many of their deans, as well as a majority of the deans of the germinal schools of religion which have developed at nine state university centers.

The objectives of the Council for the first year are to make a careful study of the religious resources of certain state universities and, on the basis of this survey, to aid in formulating plans for the development of a thoroughly equipped undergraduate school of religion at one or more of the state university centers, and to investigate the educational equipment of these centers for the training of leaders for social and religious service in fields for which at present there is no adequate provision.

As the result of these surveys the situation at the University

of Michigan has been found to be the most favorable for the establishment of a school of religion of the character outlined in the plans formulated a year ago. The response of its president, faculty, regents and alumni has been most encouraging. The Board of Trustees for the school has been appointed and active steps are soon to be taken to raise the necessary budget. One of the primary questions, therefore, which confronts all friends of this movement is the nature of the curriculum to be developed in connection with the school.

In certain aspects the problem presented in a state school of religion at the gates of the university is different from that in privately supported colleges. A large proportion of the students in tax-supported universities come from homes where the instruction in religion has been of the sectarian and fundamentalist type. On entering the state university they are suddenly plunged into a strongly scientific and materialistic atmosphere. The change is almost as abrupt as when an orthodox Jew from the pale of Russia is dropped into the democratic whirlpool of lower New York. It is not strange, therefore, that thousands of these students when they realize how impossible is the seventeenth century faith taught them in their childhood, make the fatal mistake of discarding all religion or else relapse into a state of indifference. Also many who enter the university with aspirations to prepare for religious or social service, speedily lose this vision. Here the wastage is great. For the majority of them the pressure of vocational courses and ambitions leaves little time for the cultural and idealistic courses which after all are the most practical. At the same time, these state university students are as a rule more serious minded than our ordinary college undergraduates and have closer contacts with reality. What religious life there is in the state universities is perfectly natural for there are no compulsions. Through their inspirational and expressional work the Christian Associations, the student pastors and the local churches are performing an effective service for certain groups of students. It is on the educational side that undergraduates suffer the greatest religious lack. This lack is all the more serious because the years from eighteen to twenty-four represent the period when the critical and intellectual faculties of the normal individual are naturally most highly developed.

If our youth is to attain a philosophy of life that will carry them through the crises that impend and give them the happiness and social efficiency that are the crown of all education, they must be helped to find through systematic, directed study the materials out of which to build that practical philosophy. It is at this critical point that our modern system of education is found wanting. This is especially true of the handicapped tax-supported institutions, prevented as they are by law from creating departments of religion.

As the result of detailed surveys of the resources of representative state universities and the many hours spent in answering questions proposed by their students, I am convinced that the first requirement in a state school of religion is to offer certain general courses corresponding to the universal history courses now being offered at many of our eastern colleges. Before students can develop a religious faith that will meet the exacting demands of the twentieth century, they must become familiar with the religious heritage of the race and acquainted with the great religious pioneers and with the results of their rich experience. Confusing details must be eliminated; the significant outstanding characters and movements and principles must be set forth in clear relief.

Also in the state school of religion a clear distinction between the needs of general students and of those who intend later to specialize in the fields of religion and social service must be observed, although both groups will require certain orientating courses. It is also still an open question whether or not in most of our eastern colleges we have met simply the needs of the students specializing in religion and fail to reach the centers of interest of the general student. Dartmouth is one of the few colleges that has made a serious endeavor to satisfy the demand for these more general and philosophical courses and there the enrollment in the elective religious courses has far surpassed that of other institutions.

For the general students I would suggest for your discussion the following courses and assignments of time:

The Great Non-Christian Religions. First semester. Three hours.

The background, personality, methods, teaching and work of Confucius, Zoroaster, Gautama, Buddha, Socrates, Plato, the great Stoics, Muhammed, the Hebrew prophets, and the founders of Judaism. The vital contributions of each religion to the faith of mankind.

Christianity. Second semester. Three hours.

The personality, methods, teaching and work of Jesus, of Paul and of the outstanding leaders in the Christian Church. The origin, distinctive tenets, and character of the leading Christian churches and denominations (to be presented by their chosen representatives). A comparison of modern Christianity with that of its Founder.

The Great literature of the Bible. Throughout the year. Two hours.

A literary analysis and an interpretative study of the great masterpieces of the Old and New Testaments in the light of their literary characteristics and their historical setting. Formulation of the universal principles set forth in each.

The Social and Ethical Principles of the Prophets and Jesus. First semester. Two hours.

The origin and growth of democratic ideals; the basis of international comity; the organization of the community, and state; the solution of industry's problems; man's duties to himself, to his neighbors and to the members of his family, to the community, to the state, and to humanity. Concrete illustrations of the application of these principles in modern society.

The second semester might be devoted to courses, such as the Science of Religion, the Old Testament Legislation, Religion and Business, and Religious Therapeutics, especially adapted to the interests and needs of distinct groups of students, as for example, those specializing in the departments of Science, of Law, of Commerce, or of Medicine.

The second aim in a state school of religion is to provide specialized courses for undergraduates preparing for religious or social leadership. Under this head would be included detailed courses in Biblical literature, History and Archæology, in Religious Education and in the Psychology and Philosophy of Religion.

Many of the state universities already have courses available for this purpose. In most cases it will be possible, by correlating and supplementing these courses to enable students so desiring to anticipate the first year of their graduate work.

The main objective, however, in a modern state school of religion is to expose the undergraduates in the state universities to courses in religion that will meet the vital needs of which the majority are now only dimly conscious. The only way to cover these broad fields of human experience in the limited time imposed by a crowded curriculum is by the aid of carefully worked out syllabi that will divide the work proportionally to its relative values. Detailed assignments for reading, topics for investigation and reports should also be clearly indicated. Lectures, assigned readings, and quiz work should all be co-ordinated, so as to make the leading characters and teachings stand out clearly in the minds of the students. Comparisons and figures should aid in linking up this life and literature of the past with the present. The result of historical and literary criticism should go into the foundations; but the work of the classroom should be chiefly devoted to building the superstructure. The main stress should be placed on positive rather than negative conclusions. Exhortations and dogmatic assertions have no place in the academic classroom and especially in the department of religion. The students should be given the data and taught to make their own inductions; but the instructor should never forget that his primary task is not only to show them the facts but also the way in which each of them can, on the basis of a common religious heritage and the rich contributions of scientific discovery and personal experience, develop a practical philosophy of life.

I am convinced that in building and enlarging these courses we can gain much by cooperation. Today where the religious courses are elective we are reaching only a small proportion of the student body. They, too, are the students who need them least, for they are already interested and fairly well informed. The great nine-tenths are stumbling through life because they have not gained a clear vision of the moral and spiritual forces and laws of the universe and because they lack the driving power of a strong, wholesome personal religion.

On the other hand, they are gradually awakening to the need for such vision and experience. In all our universities and colleges there is today a growing demand for a religion that is based on all the facts thus far revealed to men, whether through prophet or scientist. We must meet these demands, and, if rightly met, they will grow apace. Verily those who in this perilous yet plastic moment in human history "turn many to righteousness shall shine as the stars forever and ever."

THE RELATION OF BIBLICAL DEPARTMENTS TO THE CURRICULA OF LIBERAL COLLEGES

DR. ROBERT L. KELLY, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, COUNCIL OF
CHURCH BOARDS OF EDUCATION

(This address was published in the January, 1923, issue of Christian Education. At the request of Professor Kent an outline of it is submitted herewith.)

We need a re-examination of our nomenclature. I speak of the Biblical Departments in view of the fact that they first occupied the field and are now engaged in more formal work in education which may be called religious than any other departments. There is an increasing demand, however, in the colleges, for what may be technically termed Religious Education. It is a very serious question whether colleges should add to their Biblical Department and their Department of Education a third Department of Religious Education. It would be better in many colleges to have a group embracing all three of these departments. It is really all three of these I have in mind in this address when the term Biblical Department is used.

The term curriculum is used in its technical sense as referring to subjects pursued during the college course by a given individual student.

The term liberal college is used in its original sense in American educational history. Most detached colleges are liberal colleges in this sense; and there is at the heart of practically every university a liberal college.

It must be pointed out in justice to the truth that the Biblical Department as thus defined does not usually rank among the leading departments of the college if the judgment is made on the basis of earning power. The ideals of Biblical Departments evidently are qualitative rather than quantitative.

Recent studies of the curriculum by the Association of American Colleges have disclosed four tendencies in the curriculum; to become *simplified, socialized, individualized* and to remain *liberal*.

The *unifying* agencies in the college curricula are conspicuous by their absence. The program of studies of most American colleges is without form and void and darkness is upon the face of it. There is however a marked and increasing demand for unity in the curriculum; the multiplication of freshman co-ordinating courses, of senior orientation courses, of group systems and of honors courses is sufficient evidence of this fact.

For the most part, the efforts put forth for unification have been efforts to unify the *materials* of the curriculum. It is a rather large order and not likely to succeed but the colleges have much experience in the race to draw from in attempting it under three general forms. Art undertakes to unify experience in terms of beauty; philosophy in terms of truth; and religion in terms of the good raised to its highest power. The teacher of religion occupies a most strategic position for he is the exponent *par excellence* of the true, the beautiful and the good.

Let me use two illustrations:

What kinship is there between the materials which the professor of education and the professor of Biblical literature are using? The educational creed is made up of such declarations as these:

Every American child is educable.

Every American child is a social being.

All American children should have equal educational opportunity.

No arbitrary limit can be fixed upon the possible attainment of any American child.

Every American child is free to think, to initiate, and to resolve.

Cannot all of these educational principles be stated at least with equal force in religious terms?

Or take the field of science—the scientific student is thinking in terms

Of the indestructibility of matter

Of the power of cohesion

Of the miracle of growth

Of the conception of the infinite.

Science is grounded on *experience*. Here, again, the religious equivalent is easy to state.

The greatest challenge of the teacher of religion, however, is the *functional* method of unifying the curriculum. Those who have faith in American youth are convinced that most of them have intellectual, ethical and religious interests. In some form they are projecting themselves into the future. They might not so denominate it, but they are engaged in formulating a *theory of life*. The teacher of religion has an opportunity to be an expert in guiding this process of unification. The challenge comes to him to rise above department-mindedness into the realm of curriculum-mindedness, and to interpret to the aspiring student the *abundant life*. He, better than any other member of the faculty, is in a position to be the student's *super-advisor*.

THE CONTENT OF A PRE-THEOLOGICAL COURSE

PROFESSOR HENRY J. CADBURY, HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Bibliography: Articles on "Connecting the College Biblical Work with the Theological Seminary" by Professor George Dahl and Professor W. H. Wood in *Christian Education* IV 2. (Nov. 1920.) pp. 11 ff. and the report of a committee to the Conference of Theological Seminaries of the United States and Canada—by Professor Edw. C. Moore, Chairman in *The Reformed Church Review*. October, 1922.

There are many reasons which make it advisable for college students who enter theological seminaries to shape their college work accordingly. The changes of the past generation have greatly modified the curricula of both collegiate and seminary grade. Instead of the standard college course—in the classics, mathematics, and natural and moral philosophy we have college curricula that are largely elective in which stress is often laid on the natural sciences, the social sciences and modern languages.

Instead also of the standard theological course of former times with Hebrew Old Testament, the Greek New Testament, Church History, Theology and Homiletics we have a theological course or perhaps a group of whole schools of religion which not only has a greater freedom of election but has added to the older studies the philosophy and psychology of religion and extensive developments in the religious aspects of education and sociology. The modern student who enters a theological seminary from college has neither behind him nor before him a definite and regular course of preparation. There is not a single college study which he can be assumed to have studied, and more courses are offered in the seminary than sufficient merely to occupy a regular sequence of three years. The question is therefore urgent and pertinent what should be the content of a pre-theological course of studies? If a man is fortunate enough to decide on the ministry before he has made all his elections of college studies, what shall we advise him to elect? The same question applies to the increasing number both of men and women who are going from college through the seminary and out into other lines of trained religious leadership—not as preachers, but as teachers or executives in religious work.

The subjects suggested for such a group of college studies—whether the suggestion is made by the college, the theological school or merely informally as personal advice—should be in the main the tools and materials that will be of most use in the seminary course. I am assuming that in any case the college will aim at insuring a certain degree of general culture. The pre-theological courses will not defeat this aim, for they also will be “cultural” courses.

In the first place should be mentioned a training in the scientific method. This can be taught in almost any course—including those subjects seemingly remote from theology such as chemistry or biology. More depends on the teacher and his method than on the subject, and in small colleges the method is usually best exemplified by one professor and with that man if possible the prospective theolog should be initiated.

Particularly important because of the prominence of historical and literary approach in theological study is the training in literary criticism and the use of the historical method. Few students come

to the seminaries who have ever been exposed to these principles in their study of secular history or literature with anything like the thoroughness with which they must use them for an understanding of the problems of the Bible.

Still more fundamental as tools for their later study are the mastery of Greek and Hebrew, as well as French and German. The ideal applicant for admission to a course of theological study will have a reading knowledge of the modern languages and at least one year in the so-called sacred tongues. For actual pulpit purposes training in oral and written English expression cannot begin too early.

Several theological subjects can be properly studied only by those who have mastered what may be called their secular pre-requisites. For any period of church history the corresponding course of secular history is an essential background. Incidentally the study of other ages and of other languages may be specially commended for its more general value in giving another man's point of view in their Biblical study. The theological students will be wrestling with just such problems of constructive imagination and in their pastoral contacts with all sorts and conditions of men will need a trained capacity to get into other people's minds.

Theology, like history, has for each branch a corresponding secular branch. Philosophy in all its phases comes preferably before the first courses in theology. Psychology is a pre-requisite for the psychology of religion. The history of philosophy should precede the history of Christian thought; while metaphysics, epistemology and logic are not only good discipline for the future minister, but they are also necessary for a successful mastery of theology.

The subjects suggested for the pre-theology course may seem remote from the actual work of the Biblical teacher in college. They belong to every department except his own. In even a small college most of them are already in the hands of his colleagues. If some of them are not offered at all in the curriculum, it would be a burden to the Biblical instructor if he were asked to take them on in addition. Already in many places too wide a field is expected of him. And his path is beset by other difficulties as I know full well. Has the Biblical instructor, then, nothing to contribute to the college preparation of the prospective minister?

Probably his best service will be in the course he offers for general consumption. These are elementary, outline, or general courses. They are taken presumably by a great number of students and are not intended for those who will specialize in religious study after graduation. But the future minister, whether he has decided on his career or not, is often included in these courses and the college teacher can do him great service. He can give him along with his classmates a thorough knowledge of the contents of the English Bible with a minimum of introduction and other technical material. And he can stimulate an interest and curiosity that will either create or foster the leaning towards future Biblical study.

There are, I believe two temptations that should be avoided. One is the temptation of both teacher and student in college to duplicate strictly theological courses. The teacher at least should resist that temptation. Few seminaries will recognize as equivalents to their own foundation courses anything to be had in an undergraduate college. Instead, therefore, of trying to duplicate the regular seminary courses, the Biblical instructor should help the future theologian by advice on his general course and by such instruction in the original languages of the Bible and other preliminary subjects as his ability and student's time permit. My colleagues in the field of theological study do not want men coming to them who think they *know it all* because they have already studied in the college the philosophy of religion or social ethics or have taken a half course in Biblical introduction.

The other temptation is like unto the first: it is the temptation to anticipate strictly theological work for the sake of saving time. The pre-theological course is not a way of telescoping the four and three years of college and seminary into only six years. Perhaps if required for admission a pre-theological course in college would do as a substitute for the fourth year that is threatened as an addition to our present three year courses.

At Union Seminary in New York this fourth year has already been added, but with the wise provision that the equivalent of one year may be anticipated in college. As their plan is a well considered one that may be symptomatic of the future, let me read you the list of studies that can be taken in college counted towards their four year course. Of one hundred and twelve

points required for graduation twenty-eight or exactly one-fourth may be taken in college in the following fields. (Numbers represent maximum credit obtainable.)

Hebrew Prose of Old Testament	12 points
Greek of the New Testament	12 "
Biblical and Ecclesiastical Latin	12 "
Modern French Prose	8 "
Modern German Prose	8 "
History of Philosophy	8 "
History of Religions	4 "
History of modern social movements together with methods of social study	4 "
Principles and methods of modern science	4 "

The same combination can be worked out in other ways—a prolonged paralleling of college and theological courses is customary in Canadian colleges and is possible in this country when the geographical and academic connection between a theological school and an arts university permit. But in spite of all the arguments and eagerness for a shortened preparation for life work, here as elsewhere haste means waste. The pre-theological course means not a short cut from high school to the B. D. degree. It means an earlier start in planning for life work and a more thorough and orderly training of ministers, teachers and other religious workers.

A COURSE OF STUDY IN THE HISTORY OF RELIGIONS

PROFESSOR ROBERT E. HUME, UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

This large subject may be advantageously analyzed and treated under four subordinate topics, viz., importance, method, extent, and results.

I. The Importance of a Course of Study in the Religions of the World

Religion is as fascinating and important a field of study as anything in the history and knowledge of mankind. That was a tre-

mendous discovery which was made by H. G. Wells for himself, and which he has been helping thousands of his readers to make for themselves.

Here is a phenomenon at once notable, complex, encouraging and also dangerous, unless it be guided rightly. A popular novelist and essayist, whose bias against religion in general and against Christianity in particular has been well known, has recently come around to a position of some common footing with the finest modern Christian missionaries and also with the Theosophists. We all must indeed appreciate the various religions of the world. But then there is a difference. All parties perhaps would agree that, from a cultural as well as from a religious point of view the history of religions is as important as is the history of nations. But Wells and the Theosophists would agree that the religions are all about equally good. The Christian advocate maintains that Christianity is perceptibly different from the other religions, even while it includes all that is best in those other religions. Indeed, Christianity is decidedly superior for the very reason that it comprehensively includes all that is best in the other religions.

From an intensive study of the sacred scriptures of the various religions, I make bold to state that Wells does not know the historic documentary facts when he makes statements concerning Muhammadanism, Buddhism and Christianity such as the following:

"Islam . . . was the broadest, freshest and cleanest political idea that had yet come into activity in the world, and it offered better terms than any other to the mass of mankind." (*Outline of History*, vol. II, pp. 23-24.)

"There was in the real teaching of Jesus . . . nothing to prevent a personal disciple of Jesus from accepting all the recorded teachings of Buddha." (vol. I, p. 582.)

However, if we venture to correct Mr. Wells on his report or interpretation of non-Christian religions, yet we must also correct some of the old-style Christian missionaries and apologetes who saw nothing good whatsoever in the non-Christian religions.

Certainly the old attitude of ignorance, of indifference, or of wholesale condemnation of the religions of the world should

properly be superseded. Several causes outside of a re-interpretation of Christianity have been at work. For example, the general advancement of knowledge, the closer intercourse between all the peoples of the world, and the relatively recent disclosures of the authoritative sacred scriptures of the religions of the world—all these developments have combined to make it possible, and even necessary that any person who aspires to be well-educated concerning the history and concerning the literature of the world, should possess some intimate acquaintance with the several religions of the world.

This subject of study is a most appropriate one for college students. A detailed investigation of the history and comparison of religions should, of course, be required without exception of all students who are in a Theological Seminary and who are preparing to become professional Christian leaders. But the history of religions is not so highly technical, nor is it so narrowly a part of Christian apologetics, that it must be reserved for post-graduate students or for ecclesiastical specialists. Indeed, I am continually receiving from my theological students expressions of regret that they had not had studied this subject early in their student years. Let this introduction on the importance of including the history of religions in a college curriculum be pointed by the following quotation from a written paper which was submitted to me by one of my students.

"I wonder if all children in the United States grew up with the perverted view of other peoples and their faiths which formed my own early conceptions. Thus, I was taught that the people in India and China and Japan and all non-Christian countries are 'heathen' (whatever that word may mean!), and that all these heathen countries are utterly benighted. I hardly supposed that they had real cities. It was a great surprise to me when I learned that the Indians could produce a poet like Rabindranath Tagore or the Chinese a patriot like Confucius. I had been taught that all of those heathen people would acknowledge all of us Christian Americans as unquestionably superior to them, and that they would, of course, seize every opportunity to make themselves like unto us. And to admit that any of those heathen religions might contain an atom of

truth or any admirable feature—that would be utterly un-Christian and sacrilegious!

“But after such early home and Sunday School training, I went to high school, and learned some new facts. Then I went to college, and met some actual foreign students and studied some world situations. Finally I came here to the seminary, and took this course in the history of religions! Thank God! But why could I not have had it earlier? I have surely acquired a new respect for man, and a new respect for God. But why could I not have had all this, *earlier?*”

This pathetic inquiry we can answer, without being too censorious of the educators of the past generation, by showing that at least there exist now certain new facilities for such study.

II. The Method of Study in the History of Religions

Within recent years there has come into existence quite a body of entirely new apparatus for a scientific study of the religions of the world. Previously it was a precarious undertaking to state definitively the content of almost any one among the great non-Christian religions. The best which could be done was to report what certain particular people believed religiously and did religiously. But within the last fifty years, indeed within the last thirty years, great strides have been taken by scholars in translating the sacred scriptures of the various religions of the world. This task has not yet been completed by any means. And not all of the documents, even when translated, can be exactly dated, though they can be all arranged in a fairly dependable chronological order. However, with this apparatus at one's disposal, it is quite possible now to state with certainty what were the contents of any religion at successive periods in its history.

Let us recall some of the notable accomplishments in this work of making the sacred scriptures of the world available for the knowledge of the West.

The very oldest among all these documents is the Rig Veda of Hinduism. Different scholars date it at different points in the second millenium before Christ. No one dates it later than 1,000 B. C. Yet, as late as 1830 A. D. (less than one hundred years ago), not a single Westerner, perhaps not a single non-

Hindu, had ever laid eyes upon a manuscript copy of the Rig Veda. Through the early centuries orally and ever afterwards secretly, the Hindus have transmitted their earliest sacred scripture with tenacious reserve on account of its absolutely sacrosanct character. Only by an accident in the year 1830 A. D., was a manuscript of the Rig Veda discovered and a small portion printed in London. A complete English translation was not available till more than half a century later, i.e., in 1888 A. D. That pioneer six-volume work is now quite unpurchasable, indeed obsolete. The only other complete English translation of the Rig Veda, published in Benares twenty-six years ago, is now out of print.

Another, and even more important, sacred scripture of Hinduism is the group of one hundred and twenty-eight philosophical "seances," entitled "Upanishads." It was only about forty years ago (1882 A. D.), that a major portion of these Upanishads, some fifty in number, were first made available in any modern European language. That was accomplished in a very circuitous manner, viz., by Franz Mischel's translation into German of a Frenchman Anquetil Duperron's translation into Latin of a mediæval translation into Persian of the original Sanskrit text of more than five centuries before Christ. Not till the year 1884 A. D., had as many as a dozen of these Upanishads been translated into English by one Professor of Sanskrit. These are found in two volumes of Max Muller's "Sacred Books of the East Series." But that translation was rather free and padded. The most extensive single piece of work in this field, viz., a translation made directly from the original Sanskrit into English, is "The Thirteen Principal Upanishads" published by the Oxford University Press in 1921.

Most, but not all, of the sacred scriptures of Hinduism have now been made available in English. But it is a very extensive field; the minimum number of pages in English translation totals 18,098 pages. There is still more of purely linguistic work to be done, if any person is to be thoroughly equipped to know even this one religion, Hinduism.

Consider similarly the history of the study of the history of Buddhism. It was in the year 1870 that the first canonical scripture of Buddhism was translated into English. Yet so fascinating

was the Buddhist religion that 214 entries under that subject are to be found in the New York Public Library dating from before the time when any person could read any portion of the primary sources of Buddhism rendered into English. As late as 1875 the eminent Dutch scholar, Kern, and as late as 1879 the eminent French orientalist Senart, wrote books on Buddhism, contending that the putative founder of Buddhism was only a mythological figure. The historicity of Buddha was finally determined unmistakably only twenty-seven years ago, when in December, 1896, Dr. Fuehrer of the British Archaeological Survey of India unearthed the inscribed pillar which King Asoka had erected in the town where Buddha was born. Even yet the complete "Tripitaka" of Buddhism has not been translated nor even printed.

In the case of Zoroastrianism it was within the present century, viz., in 1901, that the most eminent living authority on that religion, Professor A. V. Williams Jackson, of Columbia University, finally established the historicity of Zoroaster, though the exact date of that first attempt at a universal religion is still in dispute. And all of the Avesta of Zoroastrianism has not yet been translated from the original text direct into English, although for that minor part, the Khordah Avesta, there is an English translation of a German translation.

In the case of Jainism, which holds the honor of being the oldest personally founded religion in the land of India (Mahavira, the founder, having been born in 599 B. C.), only about one-fifth of its sacred scripture has been translated into any European language.

It is evident that much scholarly work remains to be done, although in the case of all the other religions of the world their sacred scriptures are now available in English.

Much, though not all, of this material has been collected in the fifty volumes which compose the "Sacred Books of the East" published by the Oxford University Press. However, nothing is given from the sacred scripture of the Sikhs in India, who total over three million followers, nor from Shinto, the immemorial national religion of Japan. And of the seven religions which have been included in the Series, only two, viz., Muhammadanism and Taoism, have their scriptures presented complete. Moreover, that exceedingly valuable, really indispensable apparatus now

costs \$400. Even its projector, the late Professor Max Muller, did not live to see that vast project completed. It has been subsequently furnished with an excellent index. It is deserving of selective abridgment, as well as some enlargement, into a well-selected "Source Book for the History of Religions."

By all these and other labors, the field of the history of religions has been supplied with much scientific apparatus which renders this study capable of being an exact science, as exact as any branch of human history.

Indeed, I plead that the study of the history of religions should be utilized for training, not only in history, but also in scientific accuracy and research along with any of the natural sciences. Formerly the subject of religion was supposed to be, and in some measure really was, liable to vague conjectures. It was a field chiefly for personal preferences amongst superstitious beliefs. At the present time the method of studying the history of religions should be strictly scientific and rigorously exact in all its investigations of historical documents. And the developmental point of view should always be maintained. Although brief summaries are of course legitimate and necessary, yet generalizations should always be supplemented by further specifications. Any citation, in order to be superlatively complete, should be accompanied with exact specifications, such as: from which stage of the religion; from which document, chapter and verse, together with volume and page and the particular translation quoted; and in whose mouth or in what connection.

Although comparisons among the teachings of the various religions are hazardous, any student in this field should always compare the best in one religion with the best that is to be found in other religions submitted to the comparison. Too often have the very highest points in the Bible been compared with points less than the highest in the other religions. An extreme instance may be cited against Christianity itself.

Although a non-Christian can find in the Bible and quote exactly the words, "Skin for skin, yea, all that a man hath will he give for his life" (Job 2:4), yet we would declare it to be unscholarly, inexact, unfair to represent that declaration as "*the* teaching" or even "*a* teaching" of the Bible. The quotation ought to be cited as from Satan, even though contained in the Bible, a

position explicitly condemned, not a position approved by the Christian Bible. The offences against a true representation of the non-Christian religions have, of course, been more numerous and more egregious.

III. The Extent of a Course in the History of Religions

In a field so vast, there must necessarily be selection and relative emphasis. Some published text-books and some courses as actually conducted by teachers give a larger proportion of attention to the primitive and classical religions than to the living religions. Thus, both Menzies and Hopkins devote more than half their space to the lowest stage of religion, viz., animism, and to the dead religions.

Certainly there is plenty of material to be studied there. But all of it could easily be made to comprise only the first of four different groups of religions which might well be included in a comprehensive course of study. Surely the higher religions are more worthy of study than the lowest phase of religion, and the many living religions than those few which have become defunct.

Of the living religions there are eleven which are distinct, historic, organized, possessing canonical scriptures. The eleventh and last, viz., Sikhism, is not even mentioned in most of the text-books. And the three historians who do mention it, viz., Barton, Hopkins and Moore, treat it under Hinduism. But during its history of four hundred years, Sikhism has worshipped its scripture with the extreme of bibliolatry. It has its central shrine at Amritsar, which has become the most notorious place in all India during the last five years. And it has a following which is larger than that of two other religions, Jainism and Zoroastrianism, which are almost five times as old. A tabular conspectus of different features of these eleven living religions may be arranged in the order of their chronological origin as follows:

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

369

Name	Date	Founder	Deity	Place	Scriptures	Number in Millions
Hinduism	2000 B.C.	None	Brahma or various Jehovah	India	Vedas	217
Judaism	1500 B.C.	Moses		Scattered	Old Testament	11
Shinto	Nominally 660 B.C.	None	Nature-gods	Japan	Kojiki and Nihongi	16
Zoroastrian- ism (Parsi)	660 B.C.	Zoroaster	Ahura Mazda	Persia and India	Avesta	1/10
Taoism	604 B.C.	Li-Uhr, the Lao-Tze	The Tao	China	Tao Teh King	43
Jainism	599 B.C.	Vardhamana the Mahavira	None, or Founder	India	Agamas	1
Buddhism	560 B.C.	Gautama the Buddha	None, or Founder	The East	Tripitaka	137
Confucianism	551 B.C.	Confucius	Heaven, or Founder	China	Classics	250
Christianity	4 (or 1) B.C.	Jesus, the Christ	Heavenly Father	World	Bible	557
Muhammad- anism or Islam	570 A.D.	Muhammad	Allah	Moslem Countries	Koran (Qur'an)	230
Sikhism	1469 A.D.	Nanak	"True Name"	India	Granth	3

Among these eleven living religions of the world there are so many similarities and dissimilarities that another helpful way of presenting them in some kind of order is according to the chronological order of their origin, combined with their geographical grouping. The historic fact is striking that all the religions which ever originated in Europe, America or Africa have died. Only Asiatics have been able to produce religions possessing vitality. And the eleven living religions, all of which originated in the continent of Asia, are distributed fairly equally as to their birth-place, viz., four in South Asia, three in East Asia, and four in West Asia. Let us arrange them thus, together with a brief characterization of their most important features.

(A) Religions Originating in South Asia (India):

1. Hinduism, the Religion of Divine Immanence and of a divinely ordained hereditary social structure.
2. Jainism, the Religion of Asceticism.
3. Buddhism, the Religion of Quiet Ethical Self-culture.
4. Sikhism, the Religion of Disciples of the One God.

(B) Religions Originating in East Asia (China and Japan):

5. Confucianism, the Religion of Social Propriety.
6. Taoism, the Religion of the Mystical Divine Way.
7. Shinto, "the Way of the Gods," The Religion of Nature-worship and of Emperor-worship.

(C) Religions Originating in West Asia (Palestine, Persia, Arabia):

8. Judaism, the Religion of Obedience to the God of Righteousness.
9. Zoroastrianism, the Religion of Struggle along with the Good Wise Lord against Powers of Evil.
10. Christianity, the Religion of Love, Co-operation and Progress.
11. Muhammadanism, the Religion of Submission to Supreme Power.

Of the eleven religions, six have remained for the most part in the country where they originated, viz., Hinduism, Jainism and Sikhism in India; Confucianism and Taoism in China; and Shinto in Japan. Of the other five religions, which have been disseminated elsewhere, three have become virtually extinct in the land

of their birth, viz., Zoroastrianism in Persia, and Judaism and Christianity in Palestine.

Of the eleven, only three have become international through missionary activity, viz., Buddhism, Christianity and Muhammadanism. Each of the eleven except the youngest possesses a record of thirteen hundred years of history. With the exception of Christianity and Muhammadanism, which are the two most growing religions today, each of the other eight possesses a record of 2400 years of history. Surely these all are worthy of study by any student who aspires to a comprehensive knowledge of the living peoples of the world.

In every one of the world's religions without exception there have been developed sects, denominations, distinct schools of interpretation, and different forms of government or worship. The study of all these subordinate divisions is doubtless, impossible for any collegiate course of study. However, it does seem not excessive in a comprehensive course in the history of religions that each student should be required to know something at least about the founder or origin, about the subsequent history, about the canonical scriptures as literary documents, and about the main religious and ethical teachings of the eleven living religions of the world, in addition to whatever knowledge may be gained of primitive animism and of the main religions of antiquity.

IV. The Results of a Course of Study of the History of Religion

For myself, I would testify that the study of the history of religions has produced a greater confidence in the unequalled religious value of the Christian Bible and especially in the supremacy of Jesus Christ.

There are a dozen points of similarity between Christianity and the other religions of the world, although at each point I believe that Christianity is superior.

However, there are three points in which I cannot adduce any parallel from the history of the other religions of the world, viz., (1) the character of Jesus Christ himself; (2) the character of God as revealed by Jesus Christ; and (3) the work of the Holy Spirit as assured by Jesus Christ.

These are the very three points which are essentials of Christianity, as formulated elaborately in the doctrine of the Trinity,

or as summarized very simply in the benediction of St. Paul in II Corinthians 13: 14: "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit be with you all."

While a study of the history of religions may very properly enhance a Christian's faith in his own religion, yet it may also be used by any and every person as a means of general culture and of scientific training in search for facts and truth.

For some actual laboratory results obtained by such study, let me offer the following report from the same student who was quoted previously as having come from a pathetically limited background:

"This semester's course in the History of Religions has contributed very definitely to my thinking in three different ways, beside the large body of general information which I have obtained.

"(1) With regard to technique of method: I feel now much more capable of studying a religion scientifically. This ability has come, perhaps chiefly, from the constant use of the sacred scriptures of the other religions. I find a genuine scholarly thoroughness in going back to the primary sources for my knowledge. And yet, instead of giving me a feeling of absolute confidence concerning any discovery which I have made, I find myself feeling, 'I must study this point still further!' Quick and final judgments are precluded. Therefore, although the course has just finished, I feel that I know relatively little about the religions which we have been studying. However, having been introduced to the sacred scriptures as well as to the best authorities of each religion, I do feel that I now have a basis for proceeding to a still more thorough study.

"(2) An emotional feeling of brotherhood with the rest of mankind has been established for me. One big task of all education and life is just to appreciate the rest of our human kind. We are more alike than most people suppose. Some people imagine that a negro and a white person are ninety-nine per cent unlike. More probably they are ninety-nine per cent alike and only one per cent unlike. Probably more of the world's problems will be solved by recognizing the likenesses,

than by stressing the unlikenesses, among different people. A fair study of the religions of the world contributes to this feeling of brotherliness. One must actually feel, as well as intellectually admit, that human beings are alike in many fundamental respects.

"(3) Mental attitude in the search for religious truth. I suppose that I have always had a certain devotion to truth, even when I little knew where that would lead me. But I rejoice that my previous prejudices have somehow disappeared and that there has come a greater sense of fairness. This very fact necessarily postpones on my part the making of final, irrevocable judgments with regard to any religion which we have studied. True, I have made temporary judgments frequently, but at the same time I have been learning to hold my mind open for further facts. Thus, in one way, the semester's work has produced more problems than it has solved for me. But I have decided now once for all that, since God Himself is Truth, there can be no evil in acknowledging truth wherever it may be found. Indeed, while this sounds very simple, this is a principle which few persons, I believe, do follow logically in all its practical applications."

Is not that a splendid concrete evidence of the appropriate results which may be obtained from a study of the history of religions? And are not the results genuinely scientific and cultural? Indeed, so far forth, are they not genuinely Christian?

Bibliography

MENZIES, A., *History of Religion*, 1st ed. 1895, 4th ed. 1914, Scribners. Old, but discerning and vital.

HOPKINS, E. W., *History of Religions*, 1918, Macmillan. Very scholarly.

SOPER, E. D., *Religions of Mankind*, 1921, Abingdon. Graphic, appreciative.

BARTON, G. A., *Religions of the World*, 1st ed. 1917, 2nd ed. 1919, Chicago University. Best text-book form.

MOORE, G. F., *History of Religions*, Vol 1, 1st ed. 1913, 2nd ed. 1920; vol. 2, 1919. Scribners. Exceedingly erudite.

Sacred Books of the East, 50 vols. 1879-1904. Oxford University. The only extensive source-book in English.

BERTHOLET, *Religionsgeschichtliches Lesebuch*, 1908, Tübingen. The only one-volume source-book. Only six religions.

HUME, R. E., *World's Living Religions*, (Announced for June, 1923) Scribners. Compacted; analytical, source-material.

FUNDAMENTALISM—ITS RISE AND PROGRESS

PROFESSOR WILLIAM H. WOOD

One distinguishing mark of the *Zeit-Geist* of our day is the zeal for truth and for reality. The terms: basal, actual, real, unquestioned, fundamental dot the pages of modern literature and figure conspicuously in conversation and address. Due to the functioning influence of the scientific spirit every thinking man today considers himself a fundamentalist.

There are however different types of fundamentalists, dependent upon the approach to and the attitude assumed in the search for truth. The scientific method, mood and spirit have created one type; the demand for harmony has produced another; the use of the allegorical, proof-text, and rationalistic methods of Biblical interpretation have added others; while the conservative spirit qualified by literalism is perhaps the most widespread type. It is this last type which has created and finds its belligerent expression in the "most widespread movement of our time"—Fundamentalism.

This new ism is technically named, "The Fundamentalist Movement." Each word has a specific meaning. Fundamentalist means that there are nine basal Christian doctrines to which every one if he is a Christian will and must subscribe. These are: the verbal inspiration of the Bible; the Trinity; the virgin birth; the fall of man; substitutionary atonement; physical resurrection; the new birth; eternal salvation and damnation; the second coming of Christ. These nine may be reduced to three great questions, the correct biblical answer to which marks off the real Christian: Christ and the question of deity; Christ and the ques-

tion of authority; and Christ and the question of redemption. The term *movement* is used to denote the fact that we have here not merely another organization or ism but the stirring up of receptive souls by the Spirit of God against the menacing scepticism, the debasing infidelity and the rampant liberalism or modernism of the day. It is this inner prophetic and divine impulse which differentiates this movement sharply from such organizations as the Interchurch, The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America or the Religious Education Association.

The general character of the movement may be summed up in the single statement that it is belligerent conservatism. The distinction is sometimes made that all fundamentalists are conservative but not all conservatives are fundamentalists. This is true but it is not the whole truth. There are some conservatives who will not subscribe wholeheartedly to all the nine points and there are some who have drawn up a slightly different set of fundamentals. But the movement like many others has undergone many changes since its conception. Today in the words of one of the distinguished leaders its main aim is "To bring conservatism to a consciousness of its strength." It is thus truer to speak of the movement as belligerent conservatism.

The history of this epochal movement must follow two distinct lines which we may name the outer and the inner story. The former is the history of the organization which goes back but three or four years while the latter takes us back to the Reformation.

The outer story can be told in a few words. During the few years immediately prior to June, 1919, there were being held in various places a number of Bible Conferences and Institutes. These were initiated by and carried on by such religious leaders as Moody, Morehead, Brooks, Gordon and others of that school of thought. The most distinguished of these conferences were those held at Northfield, Niagara, Boston and Chicago. As these older leaders dropped out others stepped in to take their place, such as Dean Gray; Paul Rader; R. A. Torrey; Dr. A. C. Dixon; Dr. Frank Norris and Dr. W. B. Riley. These Bible Conferences which were at first of a general religious, educational and evangelistic character soon underwent a marked change. They now

became seasons for the serious study of Modernism, meaning specially Evolution and The Higher Criticism. The present neglect of such doctrines as the Verbal Inspiration of the Scriptures and the Second Coming of Jesus were taken seriously to heart.

Then early in 1918 a dozen or so men among whom was Dr. W. B. Riley met in Montrose, Pa., and after discussion decided to call what they chose to name, a prophetic conference. Ten "consecrated laymen" of Philadelphia financed the project so the conference assembled in Philadelphia in June, 1918. At this time there was no idea in the minds of either the promoters or the financing laymen that a Fundamentalist movement was about to be born. This conference was called "to study prophecy, but instead it became prophetic." As a matter of fact the main idea in the minds of those who issued the call was the question of how near the end of the world really was. Had this idea prevailed there would have been no fundamentalist movement but probably a renewed emphasis upon millenarianism. But it was soon lost sight of in the bursting forth of pent-up conservatism and the sense of the urgency of saving the world from modernism. It was decided that this was the pressing call of the hour and must be undertaken "in case Christ delayed His coming." The main accomplishment of this conference was the issuance of a call for a larger and more representative one to be called "A World Conference On Christian Fundamentals." This was called and met in Philadelphia May 25 to June 1, 1919. This was the birth-time and birthplace of the Fundamentalist Movement.

The prelude to this call is very interesting. It reads: "In these days when many are denying the deity of Jesus Christ, the efficacy of the Atonement and the infallibility of the Word of God and consequently false doctrines are taught in many pulpits, schools, colleges and seminaries we believe God is calling His children to contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints." The response was far beyond all expectation. Over 6,000 persons, from forty-two out of the forty-eight States, from Canada and from seven foreign countries assembled themselves for the conference. It was thus international and was declared interdenominational. Among those represented special

mention is made of the Baptist, the Episcopalian, the Presbyterian and the Methodist denominations.

After Dr. W. B. Riley had been elected chairman he rose and stated the reasons for the conference. "This conference is called to oppose the false teaching of the hour and by a renewed emphasis upon God's revelation to confirm the faith of the people . . . to reveal to the world a new fellowship—a fellowship that is bringing into closer and closer union men from the various denominations who hold to the certain deity of Jesus Christ and to the utter authority of the Bible . . . to back up those magazines and newspapers that have steadfastly espoused and propagated God's eternal truth . . . to strengthen and extend those colleges, Bible Schools and theological seminaries that are remaining loyal to the great fundamentals of the Divine revelation."

The conference itself was not merely a talkfest but accomplished three distinct things. First and of most importance, it transformed into a functioning reality the slumbering conservatism of the time. This meant the aroused consciousness that Christian men and women are fast being led away from the Christian faith and further still, this very faith is in danger of being lost entirely. Conservationism as well as conservatism is therefore the call of the hour. Then a carefully drawn-up statement of the Christian fundamentals was proposed and adopted unanimously. This contained the nine points enumerated above. The third thing was the outlining and adoption of a program for action. This program called for the multiplication of Bible Schools over against the existing theological seminaries; the purging of all schools and colleges of infidel teachers; the turning of financial gifts from the existing Boards and educational institutions into the Boards of the Bible Schools; the purging of all religious newspapers and magazines and church papers of their liberal or modernist editors; the placing of fundamentalists on the missionary boards and in the foreign fields; the warning all denominations against such destructive organizations as the Council of Federated Churches of America; in short the placing of fundamentalists in all the positions of authority and responsibility in the church. This extensive program is now being put into action.

This is the outer story of the rise of the movement. The inner history on the other hand concerns itself with the forces that lie back of the actual organization and which it seeks to make vocal. A crisis was impending and would have found other expression had not this movement provided the ready vehicle. The roots of this crisis stretch back as far as the Reformation.

It is customary to speak often of the failures of the great Protestant Reformation; but it would be nearer the truth to speak of its incompleteness. The reformation really went as far as it was possible at that time and under those conditions. It is because of the growth both in religious experience and thinking since then that we may speak of incompleteness. Judging then from our modern viewpoint we find that this great religious revolution left many ancient assumptions unchallenged; it left unquestioned many of the scientific notions which lay back of the theological thinking; it left undisturbed many ancient philosophical beliefs; the devotional interest prevailed hence the specific intellectual ones were left in the background; the religion of authority rather than the religion of the spirit prevailed; the distinctively human and social sides of Christianity were given scant attention; ethical principles were not carefully examined; and literalism occupied the place of prominence.

But while necessarily incomplete as thus judged the Reformation nevertheless laid down two principles which have been strong enough to build up a flourishing Protestantism. These are: that authority in matters religious and moral rests not in a divinely ordained Church but in the Bible; and that every person can read and interpret the Bible. This latter principle has since been taken literally and applied to both the devotional and the scholarly study of the Book. The prevailing method employed has been the proof-text used in the spirit of literalism. These fundamentals have served to maintain a practical unity while the 257 varieties or denominations have increased, fought and loved each other. Religious living and thinking maintained its equilibrium.

Then about the middle of the last century came that revolutionary transition with its changes and forces that date specifically modern religious thinking. The industrial Revolution took the masses from the church, built up a working-class consciousness, made the materialistic philosophy of Karl Marx current

and emphasized individualism, both individual and class, in religion and morality. The conquest of science and of the theory and idea evolution created a new vocabulary, a new mood and a distinctive type of thinking. Rationalistic criticism of the Bible and of theological tenets has been followed by the effort to establish a religion of science in the place of discredited Christianity. The touch of the divine upon this physical world and upon the human body as represented in the belief in miracles, the creation and the providence of God has been brushed away and consequently materialism and scepticism have supplanted faith. But by far the most significant result of the entrance of science into modern philosophical and theological thinking is the relief given to men from the personal responsibility for sin, evil social and individual and righteousness. Personal responsibility for our action and our thinking is no longer urged. The sources of evil and unrighteousness must be sought in our heredity, our environment, in society and social forces, natural law, a mechanical universe or some other source outside ourselves. Wrongdoers are to be pitied and sympathized with today but never censured. They are the victims of the system, the organism or the circumstances.

Then came the so-called Higher Criticism, the truly scientific method of Biblical study from the historical and literary standpoints. This has relegated to the sidelines, the old proof-text, allegorical, comparative and rationalistic methods—in reality but alas not in actuality. Literalism gives way very slowly.

Then in turn have come into prominence Socialism, the interest in health and mental science, spiritualism and all the other revivals of ancient and worn-out theories and obsessions.

This review of the present religious and moral situation was necessary in order to understand that conference of June, 1919 and the rise of fundamentalism. It is no exaggeration to say that today religious thinking has lost its equilibrium. There is no unchanging center, no great rallying point, no note of authority as there was during the Middle Ages or from the Reformation to 1850. Liberalism has not yet sloughed off its rationalism, its abstract thinking and in too many instances its trend towards materialism. It has not yet formulated a definite theology and a concrete religious program that has reached the mass of men.

If we understand human psychology and the history of religious progress aright there has never been an age of great faith, increasing morality and progressive qualitative religious life where these two factors are absent. The lack of the note of religious command is keenly felt. The moral tone of the day as reflected in fiction is becoming qualitatively mediocre. Materialism and scepticism are rampant as such writers as Hudson show. There is however beneath it all a genuine religious hunger and a desire for a life-giving faith.

It is into this world that fundamentalism has come. It comes with a definite set of theological beliefs and a definite program of human salvation. It stresses some of the eternal abiding beliefs of mankind, such as God's providence, His sacrificial character, His abiding love for mankind and His eternal purpose to save those who will. It also sounds out the note which appeals to the courage of mankind to accept personal responsibility. It is shot through and through with enthusiasm and with the consuming conviction that it is Divinely appointed and approved. It appeals to the spirit of conservation. It brings back into our life that perennial interest in theological discussion. Its values for mankind are positive and not negative. This is a source of great power because the majority of men are vitally interested only in that type of thinking which may be termed value-thinking. Little wonder is it then that the progress has been beyond all expectations.

The story of this progress may be best seen from the angle of the aims and the working program of the movement.

The first aim was to enroll at one dollar per all those who would join in the fight for the faith once for all delivered to the saints, and the re-establishing of the real Christianity in our midst. The number enrolled has not been published but it is claimed that not only hundreds but thousands have responded. There has been no lack of funds to carry out all the projects.

Each denomination has been asked either to officially elect a fundamentals' committee or to organize within the group such an association. The response to this request has not been satisfactory, the Baptists only complying with the request. This refusal however does not imply coldness toward the movement; it simply means that the conservatives think it better wisdom to

abstain from formal organization. In place of this plan a new one has been devised and carried into effect. The whole of the United States and Canada is now divided into nine sections or zones, with a fundamentals' Headquarters in each. In each of these sections is at least one member of the advisory committee. Mr. Hugh Munro of New York is the leader of the Atlantic division.

Conferences are to be held in every town, village and city of the country in addition to the large annual one. The Chautauqua plan has been adopted. The country is divided into circuits over which teams of four fundamentalist speakers are sent. These speakers take a number of towns and cities lying close together, about six making a convenient circuit. The team will cover these six in the week. Two meetings a day are held while on Sunday an effort is made to call in extra help and hold simultaneous meetings in all six centers. About ten or twelve of the States have been already visited, from thirty to forty-four meetings being held in each. The attendance is very gratifying according to report. President Ozora Davis says that as you approach Chicago at least fifty per cent of the church people are fundamentalists while further west the proportion rises to as high as seventy-five per cent.

The official positions on church boards and administrative offices are to be filled with fundamentalists. Progress here is very slow and in fact discouragement is the main result so far. Whether with "malice aforethought" or in accordance with the working of natural law the large majority of these positions are now filled by liberals. There is no evidence at present of voluntary resignations though the criticism of the unfairness in the matter is being insistently urged.

The one part of the program that has attracted much attention is the plan to purge the seminaries, colleges and schools of their infidel, rationalistic and modernistic professors and teachers. To date a number of resignations have been forced, among these being those of President John A. Rice of the Southern Methodist University at Dallas, Texas; Professor G. S. Dow, Head of the Department of Sociology, Baylor University (Baptist); and Professor E. L. Shaver, Hendrix College, Arkansas. Many others are now under fire. Many investigations of the teaching in various

colleges are under way. The Baptists of Texas have appointed a committee of seven for this purpose; the Presbytery of Denver, Colorado has investigated Iliff School of Theology and advised against Presbyterians studying there; the Nashville Baptist Pastors' Conference has served notice on the trustees of Union University to dismiss some of the professors or lose their moral and financial support; Carleton College, Emory, Northwestern, Chicago Divinity and many others have been weighed in the balances and found wanting. The Baptist Fundamentalists have addressed a letter to every school, college and seminary of that denomination to clean house at once. It was one of these letters that came to President Hopkins as trustee of one of these schools. The Kentucky Legislature at the instigation of the fundamentalists of that State by the close vote of 42 to 41 just barely escaped passing the motion which would have forbidden the teaching of evolution in any of the schools of that State. Side by side with this effort is going the redoubled efforts to increase the number of Bible Schools to supply the churches and mission fields with suitable preachers and teachers. It is reported that the number of students in these schools now more than equals that of all the theological schools in the country. Figures are however lacking.

The attacks upon the Mission Boards of the different churches and especially upon the so-called modernist missionaries in the foreign fields are producing serious results. The outstanding case here is that of China. For the last few years trouble has been brewing and it came to a head last May. At that time a National Christian Conference of all the missionaries of every denomination in China was called to meet in Shanghai. The liberals managed to control the meeting and put through the vote which brought into being the National Christian Council of China. This Council which is interdenominational is supposed to act as a clearing house for all missionary work in China. An out-and-out schism was barely avoided but there is no unity and the Council will have to fight for its existence. Over against it and antagonistic to the whole liberal element there has been organized the Bible Union of China which now enrolls 2,000 of the missionaries in the field. This Council has also to secure the approval of the Home Boards which it can only do through a very serious fight. Here at home denominational conferences or groups within the denominations,

by criticism and by withholding financial aid are hampering seriously the work of the officially elected boards. The financial campaigns undertaken by the Baptists and others are moving slowly.

The campaign against the liberal editors and writers of the church and general religious papers and magazines has precipitated a real Christian war. In point of numbers the conservatives are decidedly in the majority. It is safe to say that nine out of every ten church papers are edited by conservatives. The rare ones like *The Congregationalist* and *The Churchman* have great need of sufficient courage. Such free lances as *The Christian Century* receive naturally much attention. The Southern Christians as a denomination have officially denounced it. But the significant fact here is the appearance of a growing crop of belligerent conservative papers and magazines. *Christian Fundamentals in School and Church* is the official organ of the movement but others such as *The Southern Methodist* and the publication of *Calvary Baptist, New York* might be named.

In this connection may be noted the fact that the fundamentalists have rejected and condemned the International S. S. Lesson series, Scribners', those of the University of Chicago and all other unorthodox lessons and have prepared a whole new set of their own. These are to go into the schools beginning January 1. The Literature Committee is also seeking out now writers for a complete set of textbooks for the schools and colleges and also books for home reading. The people must have sound reading. Mr. E. J. Pace has been secured as official publicity man and cartoonist, for the whole movement.

Modernist preachers are to be ousted from their pulpits and nothing but sound doctrine shall henceforth be proclaimed from the sacred desk. Rev. J. D. Buckner of the Nebraska Methodist Episcopal Conference has been retired along with some others where no "case" has developed. The Presbytery of Philadelphia has petitioned the Presbytery of New York to take official cognizance of the fact that doctrines contrary to the Presbyterian faith are being preached in the First Presbyterian Church of New York City. No action has as yet been taken by the latter body and meanwhile Rev. H. E. Fosdick continues his heretical preaching. The Theological Seventeen the name of the six Methodist Episcopal, the four Congregational, the three Episcopalian and four

other preachers in Columbus, Ohio who dared to call themselves liberals still hold their pulpits but they carry about with them many Christian scars. A conference of Southern Methodists held in Memphis last November 21-22, passed a resolution calling upon the annual conference to appoint a general committee "to purge the church of all rationalizing influences." In order to effect this purging of the pulpits of the land a Layman's Movement headed by W. J. Bryan is just now beginning to function. There is also a strong move being made to build up a new fellowship of loyal and sound Christian fundamentalists for the double purpose of supplying the joy of Christian brotherhood now denied the conservatives by their liberal brothers and also to provide a united fighting force.

In general the large aim as adopted by the fundamental's conference is to unmask the modernist, force him out into the open and then publicly defy his scepticism, and show up his false teaching. The results so far are summed up in these words: "The modernist nests are now uncovered and the gunmen are located."

WHAT TO DO WITH ENTHUSIASM FOR BIBLICAL APOCALYPTICS

PROFESSOR W. C. WHITFORD, ALFRED UNIVERSITY

All parts of the Bible have been misunderstood and misinterpreted. It is probable, however, that no portions of sacred scripture have suffered more than the books of Daniel and Revelation. These writings have been studied with the greatest zeal ever since the time of their publication. The mysteries of these two books have especially provoked curiosity and inspired enthusiasm.

Today lesson committees may suggest that classes give their attention to the narrative portions of the Bible, or to the social and ethical teachings of Jesus and the prophets; but the four beasts, and the twelve hundred and sixty days, and the woman arrayed with the sun, and the seven seals, and the four horses, and the thousand years, and the new Jerusalem have a fascination that is not easy to resist. And there is really no reason why courses in Daniel and Revelation should not be offered.

But if we are to study these books we must begin with a very vigorous effort to get at the correct point of view. A great many people assume without any discussion that the authors of Daniel and Revelation were simply presenting the facts of history before hand, and that they are to be understood very much as we understand the Book of Kings or the Gospel of Mark.

The normal person very early in life comes to appreciate the fact that there is a difference between prose and poetry, and even when scarcely able to define this difference he is not easily led astray into the acceptance of the lines of a poem as if they were the premises of a logician intent upon the greatest accuracy of abstract statement. To say that certain writing is poetry rather than prose is not to say that it is less valuable than prose. It may be far more valuable not only in conveying definite information to us, but also in giving us an impression that could scarcely be imparted by any definite information. The first two chapters of Genesis are, for example, far more valuable to us now that we know them as poems of creation than they were when we regarded them as a sort of preamble to a scientific treatise on physical origins. But whether any literature is in the Bible or outside, in order that we may understand and enjoy it we want to know what sort of literature it is.

There is not much poetry in the Book of Daniel, and the Book of Revelation is by no means all poetry, but these books are a very long way distant from plain prose narrative.

We have been accustomed to say that there are three kinds of literature in the Old Testament: law, prophecy, and wisdom; and this classification is supported by Jer. 18:18. When the enemies of the prophet were trying to discredit his predictions of calamity and to bring about his death they expressed their confidence in the theory that affairs were bound to go on as usual by saying: "For teaching (law) will not perish from the priest, nor counsel from the wise, nor the word from the prophet."

The central theme of prophetic literature is the obligation of loyalty to God, and justice toward fellow men. This is most tersely and aptly expressed in Micah 6:8: "And what doth Jehovah require of thee, but to do justly, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God?" The law literature contains not only specific precepts concerning conduct, and penalties

to be imposed, but also and especially it has to do with the ritual. Wisdom literature is concerned with the practical problems of life.

The Psalms do not seem to belong exactly to any of these three classes. They may be called liturgical literature, since their chief concern is the expression of religious emotion.

There may be indeed several other classes of literature, but there is certainly one that demands our careful attention. This is so closely associated with the prophetic that many students fail to distinguish it, or simply classify it as a part of the prophetic. That Apocalyptic literature is distinct in character and aim from prophetic is a comparatively modern discovery. It was assumed that while there might be within the limits of a prophetic book, prose and poetry, vision and narrative, the whole book must be inspired from one point of view, and could properly be designated by the one epithet *prophetic*. It may be granted that it is sometimes rather difficult to differentiate between prophetic and apocalyptic but it is now very clear that differentiation should be made.

Prophetic literature in its center and aim is always concerned with the present. It refers to the past and the future to be sure, but always to draw a lesson or a warning for the present. Apocalyptic on the other hand, always has its face toward the future. It cannot ignore the present and the past, but with calm despair as to any comfort from the present situation, it looks for deliverance in the future. The prophet always has in mind to stimulate his hearers to action; but the apocalypticist simply encourages his readers to endure, looking for a future supernatural deliverance by the power of God.

The writers of the apocalypses are the natural and legitimate outgrowth of their own times, just as the prophets were of theirs. Roughly speaking we may say that the authors of the prophetic literature which we have in the Old Testament flourished from about 900 B. C. to about 500. Then the priestly or legal writers had their opportunity from about 500 to 200 B. C. And after them came the age of the apocalypticists from about 200 B. C. to 100 A. D. This chronological division is not absolutely exclusive, as the true prophetic instinct has continued after the age of the renowned prophets of the canon, and apocalyptic literature was already coming into existence in the golden age of the prophets.

There are many apocalyptic passages in the Book of Isaiah, and there is so much of this element in Ezekiel that he is almost to be reckoned as a visionary rather than a prophet.

That men of God should cease to present the distinctive prophetic message and let their work shade off into apocalyptic was a necessity from the religious and political situation. The prophets published in 621 B. C. the prophetic law-book Deuteronomy. As this Deuteronomic Code with its many editions came to be received as the gist of the message from God for practical life there was felt an ever-diminishing need for prophetic instruction. If a man was in doubt as to any matter of conduct or ritual, he had but to go to the priest, and the priest turned to the record for the law and the precedent. The religious leaders of Israel were the priests and the scribes. The keeping of the law became the one great religious task of the nation. There was no chance for any new prophet to speak for God; because here was his message preserved by the scribes. The priestly writers supplemented the Deuteronomic Code by the Levitical Code, and were ever adding explanation and commentary, but their spirit was always conservative, and they looked toward the past. They supplemented the prophetic history also, by a complete history of Israel from the priestly point of view, beginning with creation and brought down to date through the Book of Chronicles.

But in spite of the completeness of the scribal system there was felt a lack. In particular those who were most devoted to God felt the need of an explanation of the political misfortunes of Israel, the chosen people of God. How is it possible to reconcile the promises of God concerning the deliverance and prosperity of this chosen people with their present pitiable situation from which there is no apparent prospect of release? To this question the prophet might answer that tribulations come for punishment for past sins, and by way of discipline. But this answer was not very satisfactory in view of the prolonged period of suffering, and in view of the fact that those who were most devoted to God seemed to suffer most.

The apocalyptist came forward therefore with another answer, namely that though the righteous man might seem in the present to fall short of the reward due him, either in this life or by the

resurrection from the dead he should certainly attain a fitting recompense.

Since according to the popular theory the word of the prophet had already been superceded by the instruction of the priest, and one had but to go to the written record or to the priestly scribe for any guidance that he might need the man who had in his heart a message for the people felt obliged to present it as coming from the distant past, and so wrote out what he had to say, and presented it in the name of some ancient worthy, as Moses, or Enoch, or Noah, or Baruch. The apocalyptists had no desire for credit as authors, but wanted to get a hearing for their message.

The apocalyptist, like the prophet, comes with a message from God, but usually he lacks the prophet's boldness and independence. There is no demand for repentance. He may quote the message from the prophet, and try to explain it. There has been continual re-editing of previous messages and the bringing of them down to date from the time of Daniel till the present time.

The apocalyptical writers are much concerned with the kingdom of God, and present this ideal kingdom from many various points of view. Sometimes this kingdom has a Messiah and sometimes not. The Messiah is, however, so often in the foreground that it is fair to say that the doctrine of the Messiah is a typical apolcalyptical element.

The apocalyptical writers differ widely from the prophets in their presentation of God. The earlier messengers of righteousness thought of God as near at hand, and almost as their fellow-workman—only more powerful; but the apocalyptists are impressed with the transcendence of God. He is far distant and must be spoken of with carefulness. This idea of God brings in the doctrine of angels as intermediaries between God and man. In contrast with the almost complete absence of reference to angels in the early parts of the New Testament, we have in the apocalypses the suggestion of a complete angelic world, the counterpart of that in which we live. The conflicts of the angelic powers with one another control the conflicts between good and evil upon the earth.

Another mark of apocalyptic is the constant use of vision, dream, and allegorical imagery. Possible some of these visions

were genuine psychological experiences; but for the most part they are conventional literary schemes.

Apocalyptic abounds in information in regard to heaven, the resurrection, the future life and other-worldliness in general. Our authors are always despairing of the present and setting their hopes on the future. There is frequently expressed a pessimistic belief in the dualism of right and wrong. Not all the angels are ministers and messengers of God: some of them are his opponents and enemies. The powers of evil are dominant now, and must prevail for a while, although the ultimate triumph of God and right is assured.

The apocalyptists lay great emphasis upon the individual, and less and less upon the nation and the community. It was through these teachers that we began to learn of the resurrection for the individual. They also laid emphasis upon the fewness of those who attain the blessings of the world to come.

The apocalyptists held the doctrine which we call determinism. They thought of all events of history as mechanically foreordained, and may perhaps be credited with being the founders of Calvinism. The prophets had taught that the future depends upon human conduct, and that every "Thus saith the Lord" is conditional.

Apocalyptic is like prophecy founded in faith in God and his promises. Its main object is to solve the difficulties connected with belief in God's righteousness when the present misery of his saints seems to suggest a denial of his love, or of his power. We should ever be ready to acknowledge the great debt which the world owes to this kind of sacred literature; for the apocalyptists have presented a message that is valuable not only for the time when it was written, but for all the ages since. They have taught us to trust in God's love and to continue in hope not only when fortune seems to smile upon us, but when the heavens are covered with clouds and the whole outlook is discouraging. But when we look at the message of these writers calmly we have to admit that it must be read with great carefulness lest we get a wrong emphasis. Some times the prophets, in their zeal to give warning of impending doom, disheartened those to whom they would proclaim a message of repentance. So the apocalyptists have in the past aroused false hopes, and today are presenting a false philosophy of life.

I used to think that it was a waste of time to puzzle over the mysteries of the visions of Daniel and the Revelation; but it is worth while to know something of these masterpieces of apocalyptic, not only that we may get their message of hope and cheer, but also that we may be warned against taking too seriously the husk in which their message had to be enclosed.

At first sight the vagaries of modern teachers and preachers who lay supreme emphasis upon the apocalyptic element in scripture may seem harmless. What does it matter if they think now that the world is coming to an end in 1924? When 1924 comes and the world goes on as usual they will have a new date set in the future. It is quite conceivable that this fixing of the time of the end will in many cases prove no particular damage to a man's character and usefulness, just as the maturity of notes has no particular effect upon the professional borrower. But there are other beliefs of those who take the apocalyptic symbolism seriously that really are a menace to right thinking. They believe that the world is evil and growing worse because God has determined this as His plan. The world is not now under the power of God, but under the power of Satan. All earthly governments are of the Evil One, and even the church itself in its visible form is as bad as the state, and is doomed to destruction. There is no use of trying to reform the world or to resist the spread of evil, because nothing that man can do will be of account; and we might better rejoice when we see affairs going from bad to worse, and violence and corruption on the increase, because when all things are as bad as they can be God will interfere by a miracle and usher in the millennial age when Jesus himself will come and reign in Jerusalem, and the Jews will be re-established as a sovereign nation, and all the people in the world will have to travel to Jerusalem once a year to celebrate the feast of tabernacles.

No wonder that in the late war the United States Government found some of the most conspicuously disloyal of its citizens among the ranks of the most religious people. How can a man be very loyal to his nation when he believes that all government is of Satan? It is true that many religious people are far better than their creed. Soldiers have gone forth to fight against the oppression and violence of Germany even when they felt that they were giving their lives in a vain endeavor. Missionaries of the

cross have gone forth to proclaim the Gospel to the heathen even when they felt that only a few could be rescued from sin, and that there is no hope that the preaching of the cross will win the world to Christ. They have thought of proclaiming the Gospel as a matter of loyalty to their Master rather than a constructive service to the world.

The trouble with these modern disciples of the apocalyptists is that their minds are hampered by their doctrine of the literal infallibility of the scripture, and so they come naturally to a pre-millennial theory that is dualistic and pessimistic, and mechanical and unethical. Pre-millennialism and post-millennialism are both out-of-date in a world that is thoughtful and scientific.

One may properly indulge in pessimism now and then on a blue Monday to counterbalance undue elation; but we should not take this matter too seriously. The world is growing better. A belief in dualism is a dishonor to God. There is no power to compare with that of our God. But God himself cannot gain the great moral victories without our help. We are not to stand by and wait for God to overthrow the powers of darkness by some great catastrophe. He is not going to conquer the world in that way, and if he could it would not be worth while. The world is to be won for the kingdom of God by moral suasion.

The Revelation says: "He that is unrighteous, let him be unrighteous still." He means that the end is so near that there is no use trying to change. We know that the end is far off, but every moment is valuable, and it is up to us to make the world a better place to live in.

Apocalyptic presents for us a great message of comfort. No matter how great our present misfortunes and trials, no matter how gloomy the outlook, we may be encouraged to wait with calmness for the manifestation of the power of God. But we are not to wait in idleness, and must hustle while we wait.

Daniel and Revelation deserve our enthusiastic study; but we should be careful to gain and maintain the right point of view.

THE TEACHING OF JESUS CONCERNING SOCIAL PLEASURE AS RECORDED IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

PROFESSOR LAURA H. WILD, MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE

Professor Ellwood in his book, "The Reconstruction of Religion" affirms that we in this modern so-called Christian country of America are not really Christian, in fact very far from it, are nearly, if not, quite semi-pagan, and unless we return speedily to the teachings of Jesus we shall soon become wholly pagan. He names the motives of *power* and *pleasure* as the outstanding motives of a pagan society and asserts that we have been operating our civilization almost entirely or at least most conspicuously upon those motives.

The important question then to one who wishes to be a Christian is what are the motives of conduct which Jesus inculcated and what did Jesus have to say concerning the conduct of the world based upon the world's motives of power and pleasure?

I have been asked to review the Biblical teachings concerning social pleasure, but this is too much of a task for the brief time at my disposal and I therefore confine myself to Jesus' teachings and example as shown in the Synoptic Gospels.

Certain questions which Professor Ellwood raises in his chapter on Pleasure it will be well for us to hold in mind as we are reviewing the text of the gospels and apply them to Jesus' position; for example:

What was Jesus' teaching concerning leisure?

Was He opposed to a leisure class?

What did He think leisure is for?

Did Jesus think play and amusement necessary?

At any rate, did He think relaxation necessary?

Did He have in mind at all what sociologists mean today when they talk of a socially constructive, creative force in the use of pleasure?

Did He teach that religion should control social pleasures?

Was He definitely opposed to the pagan pleasures of His day?

Did He consider them merely the gratification of animal impulses and appetites, of primitive passions which must be con-

trolled and superceded by higher pleasures? Or did He recognize that there was something good in them if not over-indulged?

Did He recognize that pleasures and amusements had been commercialized in His day as in ours and that the lust of economic profit had distorted the normal use of pleasure?

Did He throw out any hint of the necessity of the control by society of such exploitation of pleasures and if so of the substitution of wholesome recreation for degrading forms?

Did He recognize the necessity of prohibitions and taboos and emphasize the negative rather than the positive attitude toward amusements?

Did He have anything to say concerning ascetic repressions or the purging of society through a Puritanism of any sort?

Did He make any place for art; e.g., the stage and the dance?

Did He recognize the temptations of wealth and power and center his attention upon the removal of the cause for unwholesome pleasures, rather than blaming society for the natural product of the age in which He lived?

Did He give any reason for His scorn of unwholesome practices except that they were irreligious, such a reason, for example, as is educed today that such practices waste the precious energies of the individual and of society?

Did He recognize the necessity of a period of religious education before men would see the normal life that should be lived in a wholesome way?

Such questions as these are rendered the more pertinent because we are increasingly recognizing the similarity in many respects between the cosmopolitan life of the first century A. D. in the Roman Empire and that which we observe in our own era. Yet are we expecting too much of Jesus and those early gospel documents when we look for anything at all comparable to the present-day sociologists' analysis of social conditions, needs and remedies?

Professor Ellwood says that the principles which must control pleasures today if our society is to be Christian are these, that they must be recreative, unselfish, educational and spiritual. Did Jesus make any such analysis or even give us grounds to say that He taught that?

Professor Ellwood asserts that "It must be true Christianity, or the religion of Jesus, which will solve the problem of social

pleasure and amusements in our society. When our social life is suffused with the spirit of Jesus' teachings, there will be no perplexing problem left in regard to such matters. Not legislation but religion and moral education, education in the principles of social religion and ethics as laid down by Jesus, must solve the problem."

Where did Professor Ellwood get his authority for saying that, for he does not give us any study of the sources? We may rejoice most heartily as Christians that a sociologist is coming out so flatly in favor of Biblical teaching. But the scholar must be sure what is the teaching of Jesus as distinct from the teaching of the church or of an eclectic religion evolved with the help of many contributing influences. Is Professor Ellwood quite right in his statements and can we prove it by reading our Gospels?

What then do the Gospels say? Our answer must be divided into two sections based upon an examination of Jesus' own personal sanctions of or oppositions to the customs of His day and upon His actual teachings.

A. First, then, did Jesus sanction by His own conduct the prevailing practices concerning social pleasure or did He oppose them or did He put up with them for the time being while setting in motion some higher motive which would in time change the social conditions?

We find Him visiting the capitol at the time of the Feasts (Luke 2:41-50) and recommending the fellowship of festivals and suppers even to His last days on earth, eating and drinking with publicans and sinners (Mark 2:16), **refraining from fasting as John and the Pharisees did** (Mark 2:18 f.), refusing to make the Sabbath a Puritanical day (Mark 2:27), not approving of long faces and a sad countenance even if men should fast (Mark 6:16, 17), and He contrasts Himself with John as no ascetic (Matthew 11:18, 19), accepts dinner invitations (Luke 7) and eats bread with rulers (Luke 14) and misses the social ceremonies of welcome and respect, when not offered Him as guest (Luke 7); He is very sensitive to proper courtesy as shown by the rebuke He gave in His parable to those who made foolish excuses for the dinner party (Luke 14); He accepts the substance of the wealthy (Luke 8), has evident pleasure in getting a large crowd to sit upon the grass and in seeing that they were fed in as hospitable a manner

as a modern church feeds its constituency at a church social (Matthew 14), and He enjoyed the hospitality of the Bethany home (Luke 10, etc.), and took great pleasure in little children (Mark 10: 13 f.). But on the other hand He speaks slightly of the luxury and soft living of many of those who come to see John the Baptist (Matthew 11). It may be the editor's idea but the gospel of Matthew has the same tone in briefly mentioning the fact of Herod's living with his brother's wife and the dancing of her daughter (Matthew 14), and Luke makes Jesus denounce the rich who are living in such luxurious and licentious fashion (Luke 6: 24). At the same time Jesus draws a decided contrast between the austere simplicity of John's life and his own freer way of eating and drinking and taking the ordinary social customs as a matter of course. But it is to be noted that He does not wish Martha to fuss over a big dinner and would much prefer just one thing to eat if with that He could have the mental and spiritual fellowship which is the highest pleasure (Luke 10). While He is formal enough to accept the Pharisee's invitation to dinner and to miss the ceremonies of respect and hospitality He is quite unconventional in the way He allows the woman who was a sinner to approach Him at the table (Luke 7), and seems not to advocate at all the punctilious keeping of observances (Mark 2: 28; Luke 6 & 13; Matthew 15; Mark 7). He denounces the adulterous and sinful generation (Mark 8: 38) and Himself seems most of the time to be living the simplest of lives, simpler even than the foxes and the birds of the air (Matthew 8: 20). He had no use whatsoever for the social climber (Luke 14). He attended the feasts but denounced the rivalries for position there which seemed to absorb men's attention. He did seem, however, to believe in things glorious, in the outward expression and display of respect, in a triumphal entry into the city, however humble the procession that followed Him may have been (Mark 11, etc.). His standards of measurement seem to have been inner motives rather than outward appearance, for while publicans and harlots were condemned by respectable society He did not consider them outcast (Matthew 11: 19, etc.) and in His indignation against those who bought and sold in the temple it was against their greedy extortion and wholly materialistic motive that it seems directed rather than the mere fact of buying and selling (Mark 11, etc.) and He seemed

to transform even eating and drinking into a religious and uplifting act when He blessed the bread and gave God thanks (Luke 22 & 24).

B. Now turning to the definite teachings of Jesus concerning the Kingdom He came to set up, did He advocate an abolition of wordly forms of pleasure just as soon as His followers should become strong enough to resist the customs of the day or simply keeping them in a subordinate place, and did He teach that ultimately His disciples would cease to desire such pleasures because other and higher pleasures would become more attractive?

He certainly does teach the necessity of thought-control (Mark 5:28), and talks of the single eye (Matthew 6:22; Luke 11:34) and says not to lay up treasures on earth but rather in heaven (Matthew 6:20, 21), that men cannot serve two masters, God and mammon (Matthew 6:24). He picks out food and raiment especially as objects *not* to worry about (Matthew 6:28, 25). The epicure and the lady of fashion would evidently meet his disapproval because their minds are not free to pay attention to higher things. "To eat, drink and be merry" is an adage pointing in a dangerous direction (Luke 12:14) and yet in the parable of the marriage feast He evidently sanctioned dressing for the occasion in mentioning the wedding garment (Matthew 22), but respecting persons simply for position or ostentation He condemns (Matthew 23:5). And the mere act of being sociable is not enough, for merely eating and drinking in the Lord's presence is inadequate. The fellowship of the Kingdom is based on something deeper (Luke 13:26; Luke 22). Suppers should be given for those who cannot return the favor, yet from all of Jesus' teaching even such suppers must have in them the feeling of true fellowship rather than charity (Luke 14:12). Luke makes mention of the *doubtful* mind in this connection as if such habits of thought were conducive to skepticism and hesitancy, a divided mind which would prove ineffective (Luke 12:29). He inserts a remarkable clause in the prayer He taught His disciples, "Give us day by day our bread." This sounds like the simple life (Matthew 6:11). He recognizes bread and fish as the *good* gifts of an earthly father but only to point out the better gifts of the Heavenly Father (Luke 11). He commends the pleasure of *giving* (Luke 6:38) rather than of receiving and praises simplicity and

innocence as against pride in wisdom and understanding (Matthew 11:25), ambition and chief seats (Luke 11:43), as the world judges of greatness. He speaks disapprovingly of the cares of this world and the deceitfulness of riches (Mark 4:19; Luke 8:14) and commends moral earnestness rather than absorption in the pleasures of this life (Mark 4:20). He condemns idle words (Matthew 12) and talks of the narrow gate that leads to real life as opposed to the easy, broad way that leads to destruction (Matthew 7:13). He points to the fact that real treasures are found in the heart-life rather than outward appearance (Matthew 6:19, 22, etc.; Matthew 7; Luke 12:14) and at the same time says that outward conduct is the *fruit* by which we are to judge the real character (Matthew 7:16 f.). In His parables of the Kingdom He calls attention very pointedly to the joy of finding the hidden treasure and the pearl of great price and being willing to sacrifice other things for the sake of these (Matthew 13) and yet He commends calling neighbors and friends together in fellowship and feasting, especially over spiritual finds which the lost sheep and the lost coin and the lost boy typify (Luke 15). "To make merry and be glad!" seems to Him a very normal expression of human beings, to be indulged in most certainly and even extravagantly—but over things worth while. He does not commend a long face nor long prayers (Matthew 6:16, 17). But He does commend costly gifts in show of devotion (Mark 14:3-9). His charges to His disciples do not include any emphasis on recreation or pleasure, and elsewhere He says we should be willing to take up our cross and lose our life for the sake of the higher life (Matthew 16:26, Matthew 10:38, 39). The parable of the rich fool is a pointed lesson against greed and covetousness and setting one's mind on this world's goods (Luke 12), also that of the prodigal son (Luke 15). It is the *waste* of his energies which is there emphasized. The point of the parable of the rich man and Lazarus is not so much that the man was rich but that he considered his riches his *summum bonum* (Luke 16). He does not say those who are rich toward God must taboo earthly riches. He does not warn the rich young man because of his possessions but because he is so wedded to them, but it is possible even for the rich to get the right point of view (Luke 12). The parable of the pounds seems to favor possession of money and

good investments and gains; the man who did not make any money is the one condemned (Luke 19), but He mentions lovers of money as those who are inclined to scoff at spiritual things (Luke 16: 14), i.e., it is not having the money but its effects we must look out for, not possessing it but exalting it out of place (Luke 18: 14). It is even desirable to have houses and brethren and lands although one's right to them should be willingly given up for the sake of the great cause (Mark 10: 29f). He condemns looseness in marriage relations and in this connection points very decidedly to inner thoughts and motives (Luke 16: 18; Matthew 5). He would not have His disciples exalt themselves nor become self-centered (Luke 22: 25; Mark 10). He does not disparage a love of beauty but rather commends it in observing the lilies of the field and all beauties of Nature (Matthew 6: 27). But He says there must be a difference between the conduct of Christians and the way the world acts towards all *material* things—a recognition that they are transient and life's most precious assets lie elsewhere (Matthew 6: 30). There are two great commandments, to love God and to love our fellowmen (Luke 10: 25 f.), and in all our discovery of fellowship with God and man we must be careful to use material things simply as a means to the deeper realizations, not to discard them as unholy but to keep them in the right place (Matthew 16: 26; Luke 16). If men begin to revel because they think there is no punishment they have turned everything around the wrong way, for it is *power*, efficiency, spiritual dynamic which brings "the joy of the Lord" and that kind of power and authority comes only in one way—by faithfulness and highest allegiance to the one great cause of the Kingdom (Luke 22: 25). Glory will then come, a glory surpassing anything based merely on the material (Luke 24: 49).

To sum up:

Granting the difficulty of getting at precisely Jesus' own expression of truth because of the human medium of the authors of the Gospels, yet the most reliable material we have, the Synoptic Gospels, would seem to show Jesus teaching by His own example and by His words, not an ascetic or puritanic foregoing of worldly pleasure but a subordination of all material means of enjoyment to higher spiritual joys and a *control* of these gifts through the motive of complete devotion to spiritual things. Power and pleasure

for their own sakes or gained merely on a low level are to be shunned, but power and pleasure on the higher levels are to be rejoiced in.

If, as Professor Ellwood says, our age must come back to a new Puritanism, in order to be Christian, it must mean the realization that noble living is on the basis of *control* rather than *indulgence*, of willingness to sacrifice the less for the greater, the material for the spiritual, but a recognition of the proper use of all things given us in life's experience. One of the most remarkable characteristics of our Lord, increasingly impressed upon us as we study the Gospels carefully, is His wonderful *balance* and ability to keep all things in proper proportion and not to go to extremes, a much needed lesson for our unbalanced age.

Jesus Himself did not outline the social needs and group His teachings as we do in this scientific age, but nevertheless He did probe to the root of the matter and set in motion principles quite in opposition to those prevailing in society in His day. Insofar as we are following those which were dominant in Roman society we are certainly pagan even in a so-called Christian land. Insofar as we have adopted the fundamental teachings of Jesus and are applying them with all the intelligence at our command we are evidently Christian.

THE BIBLICAL MATERIAL ON THE ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF TODAY

PROFESSOR RALPH K. HICKOK, WELLS COLLEGE

Whatever may be our individual views with regard to economic problems and their solution, few of us would dissent from the following statement of Ellwood in his chapter on "Religion and Economic Life" (p. 212): "No phase of life has come less definitely under the influence of ethical religion than the economic. It is in the economic sphere that we expect selfishness to be most in evidence; and it was the observation of the economic life of the nineteenth century which built up the philosophy which proclaimed that self-interest rules all men in all things, and even that action upon any other basis than self-interest is inconceivable. It

is in the economic sphere, in a word, that the baldest selfishness, greed, and inconsiderateness of others is to be found."

It is a familiar statement that selfishness and sin are very closely akin. If then it be true, as this passage suggests, that selfishness dominates the economic world, it is surely time we searched our Bibles or our consciences or both to discover such light as may be available in this field.

My task is to make some suggestions with regard to the Biblical material for the economic problems of today. I do not need to remind you that the task is impossible except in a very superficial fashion. I shall content myself with asking you to think along four lines.

I. First: not all Biblical economic teaching can be accepted today.

In this company so commonplace a statement does not need to be stressed. We are familiar enough with the fact of development along all lines, religious, social, economic, political, moral, which the pages of the Bible reveal. This is naturally more evident in the Old Testament than in the New since the Old Testament covers so long a period of time. Even in the New Testament it is clear enough. The Old Testament tells of a group of desert folk who came into a land already occupied by more highly developed people and then traces first, their struggle to establish themselves there and later, the problems and tasks of varying sort which confronted them in the course of their history. It is clear that under such circumstances, and with such diverse social situations and problems in the background, a good many Old Testament passages will suggest solutions which will have no point or meaning for us today.

By the same token certain other problems which have become very urgent with us will not yet have been recognized as such by these people of another day.

Only a few illustrations need be given: (1) There is the teaching as to the taking of interest. "If thou lend money to any of my people with thee that is poor, thou shalt not be to him as a creditor; neither shall ye lay upon him interest" (Ex. 22: 25). "And if thy brother be waxed poor, and his hand fail with thee; then thou shalt uphold him: as a stranger and a sojourner shall he live with thee. Take thou no interest of him or increase, but

fear thy God; that thy brother may live with thee. Thou shalt not give him thy money upon interest, nor give him thy victuals for increase" (Lev. 25: 35-37). "Thou shalt not lend upon interest to thy brother; interest of money, interest of victuals, interest of anything that is lent upon interest. Unto a foreigner thou mayest lend upon interest, but unto thy brother thou shalt not lend upon interest" (Deut. 23: 19-20). Such laws find frequent reflection in the writings of Psalmist and prophet—for example, Ezekiel 18: 8 "he that hath not given forth upon interest, neither hath taken any increase . . . he is just, he shall surely live." So also in the 15th Psalm, one of the marks of the ideal citizen of Zion is that "he putteth not out his money to interest" (Psalm 15: 5).

Twenty years ago an old man whom I genuinely and deservedly honored, in presenting me with a book of which he was the author, the title of which was "Usury," in which he had taken such passages as these as God's commands for us today, begged me to accept this as the greatest of all reforms the world needs—that money should not be permitted to earn money. By contrast we find Ellwood saying, convincingly as it seems to me: "Saving is a service rendered to society, of a conservative rather than a creative sort, and, in spite of all ideas to the contrary, equally entitled to economic reward, though the reward to creative labor in a society which hopes to be progressive must be kept proportionately larger. All human progress, however, rests upon the accumulation of economic goods as well as upon the accumulation of knowledge and good will. All waste in human society is a waste of life, while all saving and conserving makes possible the further upbuilding of life. The ethical legitimacy of interest, considered as a social reward for personal saving, can be questioned only by those who fail to appreciate the positive function of saving as a form of social service in economic life."

(2) A second illustration: the Rechabites of Jeremiah's day (Jer. 35) would have solved the religious problems which perplexed them so sincerely by an economic reform which involved yielding up all the social gains of all the years since their fathers came out of the desert.

(3) And, to mention just one more illustration, the system of land tenure involved in the Year of Jubilee is one which none would advocate today. Some among us might plead for a more

radical procedure, involving a complete surrender of private ownership, but it is unlikely that this particular Old Testament program would appeal to many among us today.

II. Not all interpretations of Biblical economic teaching can be accepted as sound.

This too is a commonplace. We all are familiar enough with the arguments used by earnest Christian people in a former day in support of slavery as a divinely appointed institution. In like fashion there are those among us today who are attacking the eighteenth amendment to the constitution by means of arguments drawn from the pages of the Bible.

Perhaps the outstanding illustration, however, of what I have in mind may be found in the labored and often heated attempts to prove that Christianity began as a communistic organization and that it only lost its communistic character as it lost the first flush of its Christian feeling. The argument is based of course upon the familiar passages in Acts which tell us how "all that believed were together and had all things common, and they sold possessions and goods, and parted them to all, according as any man had need" (Acts 2:44-45). "And the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and soul; and not one of them said that aught of the things which he possessed was his own" (Acts 4:32). It would be laboring the point unduly to point out in detail that what we have here is a spirit of brotherhood, in a small group moreover, and not a genuine communism. There is nothing therefore in the book of Acts which can be rightly be claimed as invalidating the strong statement Ellwood makes (p. 219): "Anything like pure communism is impossible in civilized society. Even so-called primitive communism restricted the progress of the peoples who practised it and was largely responsible for such peoples remaining in an undeveloped condition. In the complex conditions of modern society communism is much more impossible."

Ellwood may be right or he may be wrong—I imagine he gets a sympathetic hearing in such a company as this—but this at least is true that no attack can be brought on his position on the basis of Jesus' teachings or of the practices of the early church.

III. Running through the Old Testament, and increasingly in the New Testament there is a stream of sound economic teaching

which ought to guide Christian thinking in this most important field.

It seems unnecessary to attempt even a list of the most interesting or impressive passages. More than a decade and a half ago Dean Charles R. Brown of this institution within whose walls we are meeting showed us, in his "Social Message of the Modern Pulpit," how the stories of Moses might be interpreted from the social and economic point of view. Also our President, Professor Kent, has admirably summed up the teachings of prophets and sages and finally of Jesus himself in a book which most of us have used with satisfaction either as a text-book or in our personal study.

Among the many passages which might be cited a few stand out. There are the stories of Moses' protest against the economic wrongs of his own people; there is the stirring account of Elijah's protest against Ahab's autocratic act in the matter of Naboth's vineyard; there are the burning words of Amos at Bethel in which he condemns the social injustice of the new-rich of his day; the equally stirring words of the young man Isaiah at the court of Judah as he protests against the like social and economic wrongs to be found in the southern kingdom, especially perhaps the economic wrong of land monopoly; also Micha's picture of the same set of facts, seen this time, however, from the poor man's angle of vision. Running all through is the conviction that God is the creator and real owner of all wealth. "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof." Men are warned not to say in their hearts "my power and the might of my hand hath gotten me this wealth" but rather to remember that it is Jehovah who giveth the power to get wealth, and that there is nothing we have which we have not thus received. Even a hasty and superficial glimpse into this book is sufficient to indicate that there is a wealth of material here for study, the full extent of which has scarcely been recognized until within comparatively recent years.

IV. However, fourth, all Biblical economic teaching reaches its culmination in the teaching of Jesus.

In thinking of Jesus' teachings it should be emphasized first of all that we cannot expect laws; we may only look for principles. All His life was set against the background of that first

Christian century, and he certainly had no thought of legislating for the twentieth century with its vastly different conditions.

Again, we may not expect any support for any definite economic theory such as are being presented for our acceptance or rejection today. The single taxer, the socialist, the communist, what not, may claim him as theirs, but not on grounds which can be recognized as valid by any unbiassed student of his words. What each and all see in him is of course that spirit of sympathy, of compassion, of brotherhood, which has always appealed so strongly to the downtrodden and the oppressed.

When now we turn from these negative statements there are six affirmations which may be made.

(1) First, there is no protest against wealth as such. This statement is made with a full remembrance of the familiar passages in which the risks of riches are so trenchantly discussed.

If Jesus had held any economic theory which forbade the accumulation of property we cannot conceive of his using some of his familiar figures of speech, drawn from the duties of stewards and householders. In the parable of the talents, for example, the servants who used their talents were commended, while the one who failed to invest the one committed to his care was condemned.

What Jesus does stress in all these well-known passages is the danger of money—the peril that money may control us rather than that we control money and use it in the spirit of faithful stewards.

(2) Second: Jesus emphasizes the worth—the infinite worth—of the individual. We are surely justified in holding that if ever He had been called upon to choose between the rights of property and the rights of the individual the former would have been sacrificed to the latter. Therefore, while Jesus says nothing about any of these problems we may be certain that such questions as low wages, unsanitary tenements, child labor, overcrowding, long working hours, unemployment, poverty, would be regarded by Him not from the point of view, "Will it pay?" but rather, "What do men and women and children need that they may have life and may have it abundantly?"

(3) Third, all work is honorable. He was himself a carpenter and undoubtedly shared the sound old Jewish conviction

that every man should have a trade. "Come unto me all ye that labor."

He would be rash, however, who would hold that Jesus counted work as being necessarily done with one's hands. When Jesus thinking of his own work, said, as reported in the fourth gospel, "I must work the works of Him that sent me while it is day; the night cometh when no man can work," He was not thinking in terms of manual labor.

He surely did believe that life had no room for the idle, whether they be idle rich or idle poor.

(4) Fourth, the emphasis on stewardship. All we have and are were conceived of by Jesus not as ours to use and enjoy for ourselves, but as committed to us as trustees. "Give an account of thy stewardship." "Who then is a faithful and wise steward?" No teaching of Jesus is touched upon more frequently than is this. None is farther removed from genuine and sincere acceptance by those who call themselves Christian.

(5) Fifth, the law of service. "Whosoever will be chief among you let him be your servant." In other words, the gauge of success is totally and diametrically different from that which the average man employs. It is not aggradizement but service. That individual is not great who has taken advantage of the weaknesses or the necessities of others, but who has served others. That nation is not great which has sought for itself a place in the sun irrespective of the rights of other nations, but rather that nation which has caught something of the vision which came to the second Isaiah—the vision of a servant state.

(6) Sixth, Jesus' whole ideal is summed up in the conception of the Kingdom of God, which apparently meant for him that the will of God should be realized and expressed in every avenue and area of life, in the individual life, in the home, in social relations, in politics, in business, in international affairs.

Ellwood, after sketching his conception of the things which may be and which may not be permitted in the ideal economic world concludes his chapter with sentences which I would quote as my final word (p. 241):

"These conclusions of our best social and economic thinking, after all, are not different in essence from the principles laid down by Jesus in his dealing with economic questions. He did not speak

of rights but of obligations. He had regard only to the human values. He emphasized that the first use of possessions, after self-maintenance, if not equally with it, was to help others and to promote all worthy causes. Finally, we may say, that His whole thought of wealth centered on the idea that it was a trust for which the individual was to be held strictly accountable to God and administer for the benefit of his fellowmen. These may be very simple and elementary principles, but our civilization has evidently not yet been able to realize them in its economic life; or rather it has not seriously tried to realize them. Yet modern science, we see, has come to practically the same conclusions. It might be well then if the modern world emphasize the economic aspect of the religion which it professes. It is at least safe to say that no economic disaster will come to our world through following out the ethical economic principles taught by Jesus. Some of the possessing classes apparently fear these principles, because they see that the result of their application, even though it may mean the extending of justice and prosperity to all, will be the diminution of their own wealth and privileges. On the other hand social disaster will inevitably come if we much longer attempt to conduct our business and industry upon the pagan principles which have been so much in vogue in our economic life. Here again, then, the findings of social religion and of social science are practically the same; hence there is no longer excuse if these two fail to work together for the redemption of our economic life."

THE BIBLICAL MATERIAL ON POLITICAL PROBLEMS

PROFESSOR IRWIN R. BEILER

In primitive religion the affairs of religion and politics, even if differentiated, are very closely related. The most important value sought by both is the welfare of the group. To the Hebrew "religion did not exist for the saving of souls, but for the preservation and welfare of society and in all that was necessary to this end every man had to take his part, or break with the domestic and political community to which he belonged."¹ To him politi-

(1) W. Robertson Smith, *The Religion of the Semites* (London, 1894), p. 29.

cal interests were so much the field of religion that his religious ideal for the future was in form a political ideal. There is some warrant for the conclusion that it has been a fundamentally irreligious group which throughout Christian history has sought to restrict religion either to other-worldly interests or to service as a mere protecting wall to ideals and institutions that have been.

The theme is one for a book rather than the brief treatment required here, so some limitations must be set. Manifestly, reference cannot be made to much of the materials of the Bible whose teaching might be applied, directly or indirectly, to political problems. A study of the teaching of Jesus for materials bearing upon these problems would involve not only a survey of his entire social message, but a consideration of much of it. This paper will be limited in the main to materials that are clearly political in character and that bear upon a few of the political problems treated in Ellwood's "The Reconstruction of Religion," chapter IX. These materials were included in the canon of scripture, because they conveyed important lessons from the past to the present of the canonizers. Accordingly we are in accord with the intended use of these "Tendenz"—materials when we seek suggestions from them for our modern day. No literalism, of course, is possible. Many of our political problems are beyond the horizon of the Bible and naturally it has nothing to say upon them. Even Jesus' day had less in common with our time than it had with that of the Stone Age. Yet amid the vastly different conditions there existed three thousand years ago and even earlier such familiar evils as the misuse of power, class rule, social injustice and excessive nationalism. Concerning these and other issues we cannot go to the Bible for rules or laws we must obey, but we may find in it a spirit and an ideal we may use to our lasting weal.

What is the purpose of the state? Many have seen its function to be almost wholly the development of power. That motive was prominent in the formation of the Hebrew monarchy, but the end was human well-being. Tribal interests and jealousies and the influence of alien groups in the land had been allies of topography in preventing an effective national consciousness. People were at the mercy not only of neighbor enemies, but of the inner lawlessness of "every man did that which was right in his own

eyes."² By David's day the more closely knit organization had well overcome both these evils.

However, as so often happens, the developed power of the state forgets it was to serve the welfare of the people and begins to use the people to serve and perpetuate itself. The evidences of that tendency appear in David's more elaborate organization of the court with its nobility, his increasingly military policy, and in the growing popular unrest shown in the rebellions of Absalom, Sheba, and Adonijah. Then appear a king who is exceedingly versatile, probably clever rather than wise, reputed to have been familiar with mechanics, architecture, botany and zoology, and to have been a poet and a philosopher, who took a childish delight in display and in making an impression, who depended much on well located fortresses and a professional soldiery, who built up the first navy his people seem to have had, and who revealed in his system of taxation to provide needed income for his court that he regarded his kingdom as his own private estate. This is not William Hohenzollern but Solomon. He drafted his labor for his vast building enterprises, placed his closest friends in power, promptly executed the three men who most threatened his throne and then his rule seems to have been one of comparative quiet. The "mailed fist" was felt and increasing insurgency bided its time. Jeroboam, a labor leader, became dangerous and had to flee to Egypt as an exile. Doubtless here is the source of the later unfavorable view of the kingdom placed in Samuel's mouth in I Samuel 8: 10-18. Solomon, as his son,³ regarded himself or the state, not as the servant, but as the master of the people. His reign clearly suggests to us that repressive measures destroy rather than realize national security.

Another theory of the state is represented by the old men who counsel Rehoboam to be "a servant to this people."⁴ The succeeding revolt of the people against his autocratic system which exploited rather than served them was supported by the prophet Ahijah and that of Jehu was supported by Elisha. The prophets uniformly protested any misuse of power that menaced popular rights or welfare. If not in theory it was recognized in practice

(2) Judges 17: 6 and 21: 25.

(3) I Kings 12.

(4) I Kings 12: 6 f.

that if rulers or governments fail to promote human welfare, they may and should be deposed.⁵ That emphasis was present in the choice of the king at the outset and though at time almost forgotten, appears in the rebukes given David by Nathan, Jeroboam by Ahijah, Ahab by Elijah, Ahaz and Hezekiah by Isaiah and later in a statute⁶ which limits the power and munificence of the king and his court. Throughout ultimate sovereignty appears to rest with the people and even if it is formally located in the Hebrew law or more accurately in Jehovah, the Old Testament evidence leaves us in no uncertainty that the end of all political action must be in terms of human welfare.

This spirit is found preeminently in the teaching of Jesus, even though he has almost nothing to say of government. Human welfare was his test of religion, as shown in his declaration that humanity is lord of the Sabbath,⁷ in his invective against the Phairsees and their religion,⁸ in his statement that the attitude toward human life is the basis of admission to or exclusion from his kingdom,⁹ and in his asking that his followers not lord it over the people, as the rulers do, but serve them.¹⁰ If in addition to this Jesus' other social teaching is to any degree universalized, the evidence is overwhelming that his test of political institutions is the ideal of Deutero-Isaiah's Suffering Servant of Jehovah, altruistic service for humankind. No less than in Jesus' day "we need a politics which will recognize the service of humanity as its end."¹¹ This and other similar material is instructive for a time whose laws, some charge, favor property and so the owning class rather than the people and whose legislators display a dominant interest in spheres of influence, bonuses, subsidies, and revenue whether in the form of tariffs or reparations rather than in human well-being. To be sure, these problems are not unrelated to human welfare, but if we had measurably attained this ideal, their treatment in our parliaments would make that relation more evident.

Nothing will defeat the translation of this ideal into the policies of the state more quickly than "the unsocial spirit, whether it

(5) Kent, *The Social Teachings of the Prophets and of Jesus* (New York, 1917) p. 24.

(6) Deut. 17: 14-20.

(7) Mark 2: 28.

(8) Matt. 23.

(9) Matt. 25: 31-46.

(10) Mark 10: 42 ff.

(11) Ellwood, *The Reconstruction of Religion* (New York, 1922), p. 246.

manifest itself as the selfishness of individuals or of groups."¹² Such a spirit takes many forms. It may express itself in inability or unwillingness to enter sympathetically into the situations of others or of groups other than that to which we belong. The song of Deborah,¹³ martial rather than religious and narrowly patriotic in temper, is not so much unsocial as a poetic outburst against the unsocial spirit. The people were called not to a war for gain¹⁴—though the Canaanite ladies divide the spoil in their imagination—but to a war for home and Jehovah and in the song stinging curses were thrown at those who stayed at home, too selfish to respond to the need of a neighbor or to see that the fight was theirs, even though they were not so directly the victims of oppression. The discouraging spectacle in our life today of one class facing another in sullen distrust with little or no consciousness of solidarity in either group but repeats the unsocial spirit of the eleventh or eighth centuries B. C. or of the sharply divided classes of first century Palestine, Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, Zealots, Publicans, Samaritans and Gentiles.

A logical corollary of what precedes is the demand for justice. Nothing destroys sympathy and good will more quickly than the law and government that permits the triumph of the selfishness of one class over that of another. Had Amos been an ordinary tourist he would have been delighted with the signs of prosperity he saw in Israel, palaces of hewn stone, great summer and winter homes, beds of ivory and of silken cushions, and tables laden with the choicest wines and the most delicate meats, but he was more than a tourist and saw in this prosperity the seeds of ruin. Human welfare here was a question not so much of prosperity as of social justice. The stronger were guilty of idleness, debauchery, the buying and selling of the courts,¹⁵ and short weights and profiteering.¹⁶ This champion of the oppressed blazed over wrongs to the weak, saw how hatred and suspicion were destroying the unity of the people, and declared we can no more build up an enduring national life on injustice than we can plow the sea with oxen.¹⁷

(12) Ellwood, *op. cit.*, p. 254.

(13) Judges 5.

(14) Judges 5:19.

(15) Amos 5:12, etc.

(16) Amos 8:5.

(17) Amos 6:12, tr. by Harper or Nowack.

In view of a recent report of the Carnegie Foundation¹⁸ that rich and poor are not on an equality before the law in this country, in view of the fact that the Dred Scott decision was not the last to the effect that a financial investment is more important than human well-being, that courts issue injunctions not at the behest of the general welfare, but of small and influential groups, and that it has been charged that our courts are class courts, we can well ponder Isaiah's charge¹⁹ that the judges and officials whose function it was to protect the weak have wronged and crushed them. These words are even more impressive than those of Amos, since Isaiah was one of the ruling class. Commonplace is the observation that the spirit of Jesus' message supports all this and Ezekiel's oracle on Tyre²⁰ that a civilization based on envy, pride, violence and injustice cannot endure however rich and mighty.

Such a spirit involves the treatment of foreigners. The culture of antipathy to them has always seemed to some a necessity. "It is an unfortunate fact of history that national unity, whether political or cultural, has usually been promoted by an artificial hostility to everything alien."²¹ This hostility appears in Joshua's reputed policy of extermination, possibly a later unscientific theory to account for the disappearance of the native aliens; in the opposition offered preeminently by Elijah and Isaiah to foreign alliances and influences—and for this opposition there was not a little justification; and in the post-exilic hostility to everything alien. It appears in P, in Esther and Nehemiah. The last bewails the inability of many children, because of their foreign mothers, to speak the Jewish language, a *sine qua non* to the training of the patriot, the hundred per cent Palestinian. In annulling these foreign marriages he admits "he contended with them, and cursed them, and smote certain of them and plucked off their hair."²² It was easy to blame the foreign women from Solomon's wives on for the later woes of the exile and the following reconstruction period, but their explanation was not so simple. Another spirit is to be seen and examined.

(18) The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1919. Justice and the Poor.

(19) 3: 14 f.

(20) Chs. 26-28.

(21) Cadbury, National Ideals in the Old Testament, p. 49.

(22) Neh. 13: 23-27

Despite their opposition to the disintegrating effect of foreign influences in Hebrew life, the prophets were too socially minded to stimulate national prejudice against the foreigner. Even the messages of doom pronounced by Obadiah upon Edom, by Nahum upon Nineveh—not an ancient Jewish “Hymn of Hate,” as it has been recently termed²³—and the oracles of Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel against the foreign nations²⁴ are based, not upon national hatred or an insane patriotism, but upon the antisocial vices and inhumanities of these nations. With the contemporaries of Amos we rage at the atrocities of Edom, Ammon and Moab and at the cruel deportations of Philistia, but like them we doubtless need his message which calls attention to the more refined but no less deadly evils of civilization which not only deprive us of any claim to moral superiority, but also ask us to cease condoning in ourselves and our allies what we condemn in others.²⁵ Where can we find more generous words for the foreigner or a finer internationalism than in the declaration of Isaiah that Egypt, Assyria and Israel, traditional enemies, shall worship Jehovah together and shall cooperate to the blessing of the entire world?²⁶ To that exalted idea he could rise, even though he distrusted Egypt and dubbed her “Madame Brag-and-stay-at-home,”²⁷ and condemned Assyria for her cruel lust for power.

Even P reflects this attitude toward the foreigner in asking that he be treated as the home-born.²⁸ This spirit is actively championed in the book of Ruth in its sketch of the Moabitess and her notable line. The Old Testament pays no higher tribute to the moral and religious capacity of the alien and makes no clearer statement of Jehovah's disregard for geographical or political boundaries than in the book of Jonah, though Jonah himself is an unwilling hero of this message.

The finest expression of the social spirit is given us by Jesus who in both life and teaching was quite heedless of caste, class, race or blood. If he had favorites, they were children, sinners, the poor and the humble—life that was sacred without wealth, position, learning, and even without character. The value of life

(23) Reference misplaced. Jer. 46-51 and Ezek. 25-32.

(24) Isa. 13-23.

(25) Amos 1-2.

(26) 19: 23.

(27) 30: 7.

(28) Lev. 19: 33.

he found not in any advantage of birth or privilege, but in qualities that are universal. Paul is true to his Master in asserting that with him there is "neither Jew nor Greek," "neither bond nor free," "no male and female." Jesus was sufficiently catholic to make the hated Samaritan the hero of one of his best stories and much to the discredit of a religious leader of his own race. In a once-pagan centurion he finds greater faith than he had discovered in all Israel. Much needed as this message was by the Pharisee who thought it mattered little how much he scorned the Gentile so long as he paid sufficient attention to God, it will not be amiss for the modern who finds it difficult to charitably regard or decently treat some of God's children because they are aliens, because they shelter unconventional ideas, or because they wear black skins.

If the foe of social and political ignorance is to be overcome, if social justice is to be maintained amid changing conditions, and if progress beyond what has been is to be secured, there must be unobstructed opportunity for criticism of whatever is. In Hebrew history there seems to have been surprisingly little interference with the voice of protest when it is heard. To be sure, Amos, crusader against luxury, immorality, social injustice and misguided religion, appeared at Bethel in the midst of the wealth and court nobility of that royal sanctuary, Amaziah, the priest, champion not of the people but of the king, and advocate of the "old-time religion," concluded the prophet's speech was seditious and ordered him deported without trial. "If he doesn't like the way things are done here, the roads are still open to Judah" has found its paraphrase in recent days. However, Nathan dared to say to Israel's greatest king, "Thou art the man," and to direct at him the logic the monarch had applied to another. Elijah required Ahab to look him up, converted the king's charge that he was Israel's troubler into a boomerang, ordered him to stage the conflict on Mt. Carmel, and boldly passed sentence on him to his face. To this succession belonged John the Baptist.

Not only did these ancient protestants challenge rulers. They had no fear of standing alone and often opposed the crowd. They challenged the *status quo* with conviction, courage and a complete disregard for their own fortunes. They were misunderstood, persecuted and sometimes defeated, but like Caleb with his

minority report often saw themselves vindicated. Isaiah belonged to the "silk stocking" group, but his attack upon Hebrew leadership and upon a few for their selfish monopoly of the natural resources of the land²⁹ he became a radical. In his vigorous opposition to all entangling alliances and to the people's unwarranted confidence in military preparedness,³⁰ he must have been suspected of being a menace to his country's security, but he was allowed to give his message. Micah in the spirit of a socialist, as Professor Kent put it,³¹ flays the rulers who prey on the people, who have turned the courts into a "department of injustice," and who have built Jerusalem upon a foundation of blood and iniquity.³² If he accomplished little, his work was not forgotten for a century later some Hebrews were about to lynch the prophet of Anathoth for predicting impending doom to their city and gave it up, when they recalled that Micah had spoken more radical words and had been unmolested.³³ When in the Chaldean crisis Jeremiah counselled submission to the Babylonians, he must have weakened the Hebrew will to fight and so have been guilty of seditious speech. However he was imprisoned not for this but for suspected desertion to the Babylonians when he attempted a brief leave from the city.³⁴ Jeremiah was a radical from the standpoint of both conventional religion and conventional patriotism and was very unpopular, even though he declared he had neither borrowed nor loaned,³⁵ but on the whole he was allowed to have his say.

To be sure, Jesus charged the Jews of his day and their fathers with killing their prophets, but insofar as that had happened, it had been counter to their best traditions. Jesus was, himself, a vigorous but friendly and constructive critic of his day and seems to have heeded the question, not "Is it safe?" but "Is it right or true?" If there is anything in the charge that Paul was sufficiently a Roman citizen to preach political passivity in Romans 13:1-7 and that he used heavenly themes to drug earthly discontent, it is but a small part of the Bible story. Certainly Paul was not an opportunist in spirit and in his willingness to test, to freely

(29) Ch. 5.

(30) 22: 5-14.

(31) *Op. cit.*, p. 71.

(32) 3: 1-3.

(33) Jer. 26.

(34) Jer. 37.

(35) 15: 10.

criticise and accept or reject conceptions his race had held for centuries, he was in accord with the best progressive temper and ideals of Hebrew history. In this history is much material of value particularly for those who would shoot, deport or imprison all defenders of ideas they do not hold and who would educate our youth by ignorance of everything unorthodox, whether scientific, religious or political.

Space permits but mention of that delightful fable of Jotham's which suggests that the best men prefer to serve rather than to exercise authority and that public officials incapable of serving may work infinite harm;³⁶ it permits no study of the bearing David's law of the booty which divided the spoil between the men at the front and those who guarded the base of supplies at the rear³⁷ would have upon the Soldiers' Bonus Bill! but a reference to the materials which prevailingly denounce not only war but militaristic policies—such materials as the disapproval of David's census³⁸ and the teaching of Isaiah, Micah, Nahum, Jeremiah and Jesus; but an allusion to the bearing of Jesus' thought of truth and hypocrisy upon secret diplomacy, so suggestively discussed by Professor Jenks in the recent Bross Lectures;³⁹ and not even a slight discussion of how Israelitic nationalism and individualism became "the source of the Christian idea of the Kingdom of God."⁴⁰ In these and other materials the teacher of the Bible has a rich quarry in which to work and ample precedent for including political issues and activities in the arena of the life of the spirit whose goals, after all, are "diesseitig" rather than "jenseitig."

(36) Judges 9: 7-15.

(37) I Samuel 30: 21-25.

(38) II Samuel 24.

(39) Finley Kent, et al. *Christianity and Problems of Today*, pp. 111-117.

(40) Knudson, *The Religious Teaching of the Old Testament* (New York, 1919), p. 850.

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Christian Education for May

The May issue will be devoted entirely to Methods of Raising Money for Educational Institutions. College presidents and others who have had wide experience in these matters will give concrete methods which they have found useful in the raising of money which in the aggregate amounts to many millions. Send in your orders at once for extra copies which will be furnished at cost of printing and postage.

Christian Education goes regularly to 312 college and university presidents in the United States. Besides, it goes to the heads of the Departments of Biblical Literature, to student pastors in universities, to theological seminary presidents, to many city and university libraries, and to numerous experts in the field of religious education, including the members of the various church Boards of Education.

Will not each person who receives the paper send in a check for two dollars (\$2.00) with the names of five other persons who may be interested in promoting the cause of Christian Education? The single subscription price is fifty cents per year, which is but a fractional part of the cost of printing.